

In his private life among his friends he was as gentle and lovable as a woman. I shall never forget the many kind things he did for me when I first came to Congress. It seemed to give him genuine pleasure to give me the benefit of his long experience here. He carried me to a number of the places in the Capital where it was necessary for me to get my different assignments and otherwise familiarize myself with the different departments with whom I had to subsequently deal. It seemed to give him a great deal of pleasure to do this, and I was not the only beneficiary of the many acts of kindness which Mr. BURNETT extended to the new Member of Congress.

Mr. BURNETT was devoted to my children—not only to mine, but to all children, in fact. I lived with him for several years at the Congress Hall Hotel, and "Uncle Johnnie," as he was called by my children and the other children in the hotel, loved him with that devotion which was to me remarkable. On Saturday nights, even after he had gone through a strenuous week's work, he would give the children concerts, and in that way made hotel life to the youngsters worth while.

It is impossible for one in a short space of time to point out the many splendid traits of character which this truly great statesman possessed, and in his death I lost a real friend, his family lost a true and good husband and father, and the country lost a statesman of the highest order.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record. Unfortunately, being ill, he had to leave the Hall. He suffered a good deal last night. I saw him this morning and he came here, but was unable to stay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HEFLIN]. I know that he came here from a sick bed to attend these services to-day. Without objection the request of the gentleman from Alabama will be granted.

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the resolution already adopted, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, January 26, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee with the duties and responsibilities of this high and honorable Senate pressing upon us, and lift our hearts to God for His guidance and blessing, that we may be men of vision, that we may understand the course of divine providence, that we may interpret the questions of the day in the light of Thy law and Thy ancient dealing with Thy people, and with the present manifestation of Thyself to Thy children. Grant that we may so work out these problems that it may redound to the honor and glory of Thy name and the welfare of millions of Thy people. Bless us in the discharge of the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, January 23, 1920, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the 24th of January, 1901, the Senate entered an order—

That unless otherwise directed, on the 22d day of February in each year, or if that day shall be on Sunday, then on the day following immediately, after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address shall be read to the Senate by a Senator to be designated for the purpose by the presiding officer, and that thereafter the Senate will proceed with its ordinary business.

In this year, 1920, the 22d day of February falls upon Sunday. For the purposes of carrying out the order of the Senate the Chair designates Hon. ATLEE POMERENE, a Senator of the United States from the sovereign State of Ohio, to discharge that duty on the 23d day of February of this year.

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harding	New	Smoot
Brandege	Harris	Norris	Spencer
Capper	Harrison	Nugent	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Coit	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Trammell
Cummins	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	King	Pointexter	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Lenroot	Robinson	Warren
France	Lodge	Sheppard	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	Wolcott
Gerry	McKellar	Simmons	
Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family. I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky, ratifying the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be filed.

#### FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 3, 1919, certain information relative to the promotion of the foreign commerce of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the rents received from the properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased in Washington by the United States Government, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to the law, a report showing the number of documents received and distributed during the calendar year ended December 31, 1919, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1920, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3331) authorizing the Interstate Construction Corporation to construct a bridge across the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington, at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon, and granting a license to construct and maintain the approach to said bridge over property belonging to the Government of the United States.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. J. WILLARD RAGSDALE, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

The message further transmitted resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition adopted at a meeting of the 50 commissioners representing the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Meth-

odist Episcopal Church South in the United States, relative to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany and the League of Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring the ratification of the League of Nations covenant, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, praying that relief be granted to needy European countries, especially Poland, Austria, Hungary, and Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, remonstrating against the official representation of any religious organization in the League of Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of superannuated Federal employees, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the suspension of the work of widening and deepening the River Rouge, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of the Michigan Central System Federation of Railway Shop Employees, of Jackson, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins railroad bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of Fairbanks Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further increase the pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the American Legion, of Harper, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of Bolshevism and punishment for disloyal utterances and acts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Post No. 81, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Parsons, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Coffey County, Kans., praying for the speedy enactment of pending pension legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Jordan, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide seed grain for 1920 planting to drought-stricken farmers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DIAL. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its annual meeting in Baltimore, Md., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1920.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATORS: I have the honor to convey to you the following action taken by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its annual meeting in Baltimore, Md.:

"The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, representing 31 evangelical denominations with more than 20,000,000 communicants and a constituency of not less than 35,000,000, earnestly protests against the official representation of any religious organization in the League of Nations."

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,  
General Secretary.

Presented by—

E. O. WATSON,  
Secretary Washington Office.

Mr. DIAL. I also present resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1920.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATORS: I have the honor to convey to you the following action taken by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its annual meeting in Baltimore, Md.:

"Whereas when the United States entered into the Great War it did so with a solemn declaration that it took up arms to end war and establish a new world order, based upon justice, righteousness, and good will;

"Whereas as the war progressed the religious and moral leaders of all the allied and many neutral nations proclaimed the League of Nations as the one political expression of this new idealism and as the end for which the youth of the allied nations were laying down their lives;

"Whereas the heads of Government in both America and Great Britain have constantly held the league before their soldiers as the great consummation of their sacrifices;

"Whereas it is an earnest endeavor to establish the principles of the Kingdom of God among nations, and since its covenant demands the same high and honorable standards of conduct in their mutual relationships as those which pertain among high-minded, honorable men, and makes provision for those things for which the church has long contended, namely, the settlement of international disputes by friendly and judicial methods, the guaranteeing of rights and security to the smaller nations, and the gradual and simultaneous reduction of armaments;

"Whereas it has been unanimously accepted by the peace conference as the one hope of conserving the fruits of victory and creating a world order where the events of 1914 can never happen again and has been unanimously indorsed by both the Anglican and free churches of Great Britain;

"Whereas it has received the indorsement of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its last meeting and by many denominational bodies during the last year:

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, assembled at Baltimore, reaffirms its faith in the League of Nations and earnestly calls upon the ministers and churches of the Nation to exert every possible influence upon the President and Senate of the United States to secure the immediate ratification of the covenant of the League of Nations with such reservations only as are necessary to safeguard the Constitution of the United States and which shall not substantially alter the character of the covenant and shall not require its submission to the Allies and Germany and shall not in any way hinder the full and equal participation on the part of the United States in all the activities of the league."

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,  
General Secretary.

Presented by—

E. O. WATSON,  
Secretary Washington Office.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have here two resolutions adopted by the Washington State Horticultural Association with reference to two matters of very great importance, which are now being considered by the conferees of the two Houses on the railroad bill. These resolutions, in my judgment, express the sentiment of the public generally as to what they would like to have done and what they think ought to be done upon the matters referred to in the resolutions. I ask that the resolutions may be read, and in this way I call them to the attention of the conferees on the railroad bill.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolution 11.

SPOKANE, WASH., December 3, 1919.

The fruit industry of the Pacific Northwest, being far from its principal markets, is absolutely dependent for its existence on efficient and economical railroad transportation. Our experience with Government operation and our observation of other Government activities do not lead us to expect such efficiency and economy under Government ownership or operation. The Plumb plan for disposal of the roads seems particularly obnoxious, being an attempt by the railroad workers to exploit the general public.

The Washington State Horticultural Association therefore favors the return of the roads to private operation. We call upon our lawmakers to settle the matter in such a way as to give the best possible service to the public. We realize that this can not be done unless the railroad employees are given just and fair treatment. We realize that it can not be done unless the railroads are given an opportunity to make a sure and reasonable return on the investment. But we hope that the return may be made certain without Government guaranty of such a nature as to remove the incentive for the economy and efficiency in management which generally characterizes the operation of a business by its owners. We further urge that in the settlement of the railroad question provision be made for compulsory arbitration of all disputes between railroad employees and the roads. We wish to have entire justice done to the workers, and we believe this can be better accomplished in a judicial way. But we assert the supremacy of the interest of the general public in disputes involving public utilities.

Resolution 12.

The members of the Washington State Horticultural Association, as loyal American citizens, wish to raise their voices in warning against certain aspects of the social unrest which is menacing the country. We instinctively sympathize with labor in any fair and lawful attempt to secure justice. But we fear that organized labor is in numerous instances using the power of its organization to make unreasonable demands which could only be met at the expense of the general welfare. Unreasonably high wages and unreasonably short hours can only lead to



underproduction and to a further increase in the cost of living. The present coal strike and the ever-threatened strike of the railroad workers are instances of an attitude antagonistic to the general welfare. We call upon organized labor to join with the agricultural population and all other good citizens in increasing production, in making all demands reasonable, and in allaying the social unrest which is threatening our civilization.

A. G. CRAIG, *East Farms.*  
JESSE C. CHILDS, *Wapato.*  
FRED N. KEELER, *Route 8, Spokane.*  
R. T. REID, *Bellevue.*  
J. R. EVERTS, *Wenatchee.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present to the Senate resolutions passed by the Savannah Board of Trade, the Savannah Greater Commercial Club, the Savannah Cotton Exchange, and the Brunswick Board of Trade, all in the State of Georgia, urging the use of Government vessels in certain trade routes. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present also a resolution passed by Georgia Division, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, urging the President and the Senate to exempt all farmers in agricultural work from the effect of the international labor congress control provided by the proposed covenant of the League of Nations. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD. It is short.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL  
AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,  
GEORGIA DIVISION, ATLANTA, GA.

Senator HOKE SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.

A resolution by Martin F. Amoreus, president the Cobb County Farmers' Union, Marietta, Ga.

"Whereas the treaty of peace with Germany contains a proposal to create an international labor congress, which, when ratified by the United States Senate, limits labor to '8 hours a day, 48 hours a week, and 24 hours' rest each week,' and also taxes landowners with old-age pensions, disability pensions, and unemployment wages; and

"Whereas the enforcement of these conditions will be ruinous to the farming industry of the country: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Georgia Division of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, in convention assembled in Atlanta, Ga., this 26th day of November, 1919, does hereby request the President of the United States and the United States Senate to exempt all farmers and agricultural workers from the international labor congress control. Be it further

"Resolved, That the president and secretary of this convention mail to the President of the United States and each Member of the United States Senate a certified copy of these resolutions."

The above resolution is a correct copy of the original resolution, which was read to the convention, discussed, and unanimously adopted.

J. H. MILLS, *President.*  
ANDREW J. FLEMING,  
*Secretary and Treasurer.*

#### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I am charged with the very agreeable duty of presenting this morning a petition from a very large number of women of California—20,000—whose names are attached to this petition, requesting the Senate to ratify the treaty of peace with Germany and the covenant of the League of Nations. I do not know any better method of ascertaining the sense of the people between elections than by a resort to the constitutional right of petition, and whereas many petitions have been sent to this body urging action by the Senate, there is no petition more formidable than this one which I have the honor to present this morning. Mr. President, I ask that you receive it and lay it before the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the same time the remarks of Dr. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, president of the Mills College, California, a representative woman of my State, who, in tendering the petition to the California Senators for presentation here, urges the purpose and the sense of the petitioners in eloquent language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REMARKS OF DR. REINHARDT.

On Saturday, January 24, Dr. Aurelia H. Reinhardt, president of Mills College, Oakland, Calif., representing the petitioners, women of California, made the following address in the presence of the Vice President and many Senators in the room of the Vice President:

"I thank the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] for his courteous introduction and the Vice President of the United States for his hospitality to the women of California in permitting them in this historic room to present to their Senators this memorial in behalf of the peace treaty and the League of Nations for presentation to the Senate.

"The great clock which I am facing reminds me that if America's ambassador to France had met with the allied statesmen in the clock room of the French foreign office on Friday of last week I would not be here using the time of Senate Members with my words of explanation and appeal.

"It was a Frenchman visiting our young Republic a hundred years ago who remarked upon the propensity of Americans to talk much and leave little time for thinking. Would his witty allegation bring condemnation on the head of one who has had five days of thinking, in crossing mountains and prairie, as a preface to these five minutes of speech to which I limit myself? However, it is not in my words, but in the silent suffrage of thousands of California citizens that this petition which I bring has value. These multitudes of signatures, bound together with the colors of our country, ask that action be taken for the immediate ratification of that agreement reached by delegates of 14 nations assembled last winter in Paris—that agreement which is called the treaty of peace, including the League of Nations covenant. These signatures speak for no party but for individual Americans who base their request not on policy but on principle, not on personal interest but on righteousness and justice. As individuals they ask that our Nation shall fittingly close the war by effecting an organization with our allies to make permanent the blessings of present peace.

"Individual and Nation! America's history has been the evolution of right and justice for the individual, in local government, and the federation of that individual and local right into national magnitude and potency.

"To the citizens of Western States more easily than to older Eastern States, perhaps, is visible this progress and hopeful possibility. Their vision of a nation has never been limited to one ocean. To workers in the field of education, who touch at all times the growing, expanding life of youth, is kept fresh this fundamental faith in individual merit and individual potentiality.

"As a westerner and a teacher, I rejoice in the belief of my fellow citizens that is silently voiced in this memorial, asking that the great privileges of American democracy—the privilege of individual responsibility, of local self-government, and of federation—be championed in peace by America as applicable to those allies with whom she joined in battle for triumph over democracy's enemies.

"Armistice day is a year and a quarter past. Yet the departments of our Government are not agreed as to America's relations to her late enemies and to her allies in war. Into half a dozen camps they are divided, questioning the motives of the treaty, the practicability of the covenant, the definition of words, the contradiction of articles, the spirit of allies abroad and citizens at home. Surely the world will be nearer the millennium when war becomes as hard to make as peace.

"The petitioners from California beg that action rather than discussion be now your part. The treaty and covenant make a point of departure for a new era, a working basis for 80 nations and uncounted millions who need American political examples as well as her materials and money. In human institutions nothing is complete or perfect.

"The last word of democratic definition will never be written, for self-government must ever be built up anew in changing conditions. The final democratic constitution can never be finished, for it will grow with the growing greatness of individuals and nations. But always will the keynote of democratic constitutions be intelligence and good will, cooperation and participation, not ignorance, malevolence, and suspicion.

"Gentlemen, exactness of wording is less important than rightness of spirit. American prosperity and liberty depend to-day, and will always depend, on you—the kind of men you are, the kind of beliefs you hold, the kind of governmental conduct to which your beliefs bring you.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union."

"That was a hundred and fifty years ago. And from that resolution the world learned much, as the nations at the peace conference proved, not only by their words but by their deeds. Lord Robert Cecil, Leon Bourgeois, Venizelos, Orlando speak in words we know, act in that cooperating and high-minded way we like to call American.

"And yet in America we have lost time, our greatest asset as former or reformer, as constructor or reconstructor. We have lost men's faith in democratic freedom, and our own internal distress marks this loss as does the increasing misery of nations across the sea. Are we not demonstrating that Americanism has little to do with democratic ideals? American patriots, living and dead alike, protest. Well, then, let us come to an understanding with ourselves, with our various branches of government.

"Participation in the World War by Americans was for ideals which are the breath of democracy. And now we ask for peace, and the peace is all we have out of our sacrifice in humanity's cause. Let us make it a great, a good, and enlightening peace. To be sure, our material interests demand it, but so do our moral interests; so does our Nation's past and our Nation's future. A nation—that group of human beings made one by a unified experience and unified faith. Faith, not fear. Democracy is government where duties are the foundations of rights, intelligence the basis of safe citizenship, participation the only earnest of stability. And internationalism, that federation of coordinate nationalities, is America's next proof of the virtues and practicability of democratic government.

"Let us have peace, an organized peace, a stable peace, for the sake of America, of the world.

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California whether this is a petition for the ratification of the treaty of peace and the covenant of the League of Nations without change, without reservations?

Mr. PHELAN. It is for an unqualified ratification of the treaty of peace. In petitioning the Senate I understand that while the women of California favor unqualified and unconditional ratification, they are quite willing to leave it to the judgment of the Senate. It is more to direct their attention to the importance of action than any specific action at this time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I wish to ask another question before disposing of the matter, in order to understand just what it is. It is quite voluminous evidently, and I have not had an opportunity to read it. Is there any expression in the petition as to favoring or disfavoring the attitude of a number of Senators on the Democratic side of the Chamber in voting against the ratification of the treaty of peace with certain reservations for the preservation of the independence of the United States?

Mr. PHELAN. The petition, Mr. President, is a simple memorial to Congress favoring the ratification of the treaty. The representative of the petitioners, Dr. Reinhardt, in addressing a group of Senators and the California delegation on this subject last Saturday, dwelt entirely upon the general principles of the Government of the United States, the individual independence, the local self-government, and the confederation of States in order to protect and guard the rights which pertain to every citizen; and by a logical process she showed that a union of the States of the world would subserve the interests of humanity and liberty, just as the confederation of the States has served those purposes within our dominion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Then, as I understand the petition, so far as the Senator from California states it, it would approve the ratification of the treaty of peace and the covenant of the League of Nations with the reservations that have been denominated the Lodge reservations?

Mr. PHELAN. No; the petition has no reference to the Lodge reservations or any other reservations.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does not oppose them, however.

Mr. PHELAN. There is no word of opposition in the memorial. It is simply a memorial to the Senate in behalf of the ratification. I am sure that the ladies will yield to the good judgment of three-fourths of this body, and I construe it to be more a petition in favor of early and prompt action.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, as far as I know, there have been no petitions delivered to the Senate of any moment asking for the ratification of the treaty with the Lodge reservations. All the petitions have been of another character.

#### PRINT-PAPER SHORTAGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have a letter from the editor of a country newspaper who asks that the matter he refers to in the letter may be called to the attention of the Senate. It is in the nature of a petition. It suggests a way to take care of the print-paper shortage. I think it is a very valuable suggestion, and one which, if followed, will meet the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator give an idea as to how that end can be reached?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The writer of the letter suggests that if they cut down the extra editions of the great daily newspapers in the cities to not more than two anyhow a day it would meet the situation very largely.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator if he makes any suggestion as to what action is necessary on the part of Congress in order to bring that about.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know what we could do in that respect yet, but I think we might be able to devise some way to take care of it.

I wish to add that it is the suggestion of the writer of the letter that if there is some way by which we can cut down the size of these Sunday editions of these papers it would also take care of the situation. I remember that the Senate, I think very wisely, a year or two ago voted viva voce to cut down the size of those newspapers, but when a roll call was had they beat a retreat in a way, and it was defeated. I think the newspaper people themselves, irrespective of legislation or what we can do, ought to take this situation into account. They could well afford, temporarily at least, to cut out a lot of these extra editions in the cities, and to cut out a lot of the printed matter in the daily papers, so as to increase the supply of print paper for entirely proper and legitimate ends.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On the subject of which my colleague has just spoken I desire to say that there is a bill pending, which I introduced, and which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, providing for a survey of the pulp-wood resources of the United States. There has been a report asked for from the Forestry Service on the matter; I am not sure whether that has yet been returned or not; but the bill was introduced upon the basis of the assumption that one way of meeting the shortage of print paper is to produce more print paper in the United States. At the present time the United States is dependent very largely upon pulp which is imported from Canada. We have in the United States vast resources of pulp wood, but the exact location and character of those resources are not known. It seems to be the consensus of opinion of many of those who are interested and informed on the subject that if more definite information were had as to the locality of the pulp-wood forests, their character, and the availability of water and water power in connection with the establishment of pulp mills, this industry could be more largely established in the United States.

I take advantage of this occasion to urge upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that some action be taken on the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I entirely agree with what my colleague has said, and I join with him in his request; but his suggestion would not meet the present and immediate situation. The suggestion made in this letter, in the nature of a petition, is intended largely to meet the immediate situation. I ask that the letter may be printed in the Record. I shall not read it.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MORTON MIRROR,  
Morton, Wash., January 26, 1920.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With no expression of your own, if you so choose, will you kindly bring this letter before Congress, so that it may receive the widest publicity, in order to learn the sentiment of the country elsewhere, to the end that a fearful waste may be turned into productive channels?

I have just returned from attending the eighth annual meeting of the Washington State Press Association Institute at the University of Washington. While in the city I noted what I believe to be the principal reason for the shortage of news print. It is the many editions of the city dailies.

The people in the country get one edition a day. Why are the people in the city any better than those in the country, that they should receive from 2 to 10 editions a day?

But, you say—"you" not being personal—the reason for the several editions is to enable the publishers to reach certain districts according



to train schedule, along with meeting the requirements of the city readers.

My opinion is that one, and in no case more than two, extra editions are enough for any city daily newspaper under present conditions. I believe if this policy is followed by all the daily newspapers in the United States that we shall have no trouble in securing all the news print we need at a very reasonable figure.

Yours, very truly,

V. H. HONEYWELL.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—  
Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me, I will say to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] that at his request the bill to which he has referred has been submitted to the Bureau of Forestry of the Agricultural Department, but up to this hour we have had no report upon it. I assure the Senator that as soon as the report is received the matter to which he has referred will have immediate and due consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

#### COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 383) thereon.

#### WABASH RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 11606) to authorize the county of Fountain, in the State of Indiana, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Attica, Fountain County, Ind., and I submit a report (No. 382) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the county of Fountain, State of Indiana, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, from a point in the city of Attica, Fountain County, Ind., to a point in Warren County, in the State of Indiana, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at a place near a bridge now in operation and heretofore constructed by said Fountain County at said point, all in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SAVANNAH RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3722) to grant the consent of Congress to the Alford Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Savannah River, and I submit a report (No. 381) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to strike out "the consent of Congress" and insert "authority"; in line 4, after the words "Bridge Co.," to strike out "a partnership, to be composed of the following members, namely: A. N. Alford, H. I. Alford, and H. B. Alford, of Hart County, Ga.,"; in line 9, after the words "Halley's Ferry," to strike out "which is about 1½ miles from Harpers old ferry above and about 1½ from Sadlers Ferry below, both of which ferries have been abandoned"; and on page 2, after line 3, to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the right to erect any other bridge or ferry between Harpers old ferry above and Sadlers Ferry below Halley's Ferry is hereby prohibited.

And insert:

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That authority is hereby granted to the Alford Bridge Co., and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Halley's Ferry, in the county of Hart, State of Georgia, on the west, and the county of Anderson, State of South Carolina, on the east, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Alford Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Savannah River."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia subsequently said: Mr. President, there was a bill reported this morning from the Committee on Commerce to give authority to construct a bridge across the Savannah River, and it was passed. Two amendments were placed in the bill that are not material, but which it would be preferable not to have in the bill. One is striking out the designation of the names of the firm, upon the theory that it was a corporation. It is really a partnership, and the names of the firm ought to remain in the bill. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the action of the Senate in passing the bill, and that these two amendments may also be reconsidered. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] reported the bill, and it is entirely agreeable to the Committee on Commerce that these amendments should be disagreed to. I move to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendments I ask to have disagreed to are in the third line, striking out the words "the consent of Congress" and substituting therefor the word "authority," and in the fourth, fifth, and sixth lines, to strike out "a partnership, to be composed of the following members, namely, A. N. Alford, H. I. Alford, and H. B. Alford, of Hart County, Ga." I ask that those amendments be disagreed to.

The amendments were rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The amendment to the title was rejected.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3797) to prevent the nullification of State anti-gambling laws by international or interstate transmission of bets and betting odds on horse races and other contests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3798) for the reinstatement of Henry Cronan in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3799) for the relief of N. Thomas; and  
A bill (S. 3800) for the relief of Charles Hurst; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3801) to repeal such portion of the act approved April 21, 1904 (33 Stats., 211), as relates to the exchange of certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3802) granting an increase of pension to William E. Cornwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) authorizing the erection in Potomac Park in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to those from the District of Columbia who served their country in the armed services of the United States in the Great War; to the Committee on the Library.

#### AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$536,927.37 for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article in yesterday's Washington Times, by James B. Connolly, on the naval controversy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to object in this instance, but I simply wish to say that every day or two some Senator arises and calls attention to the fact that there is a scarcity of print paper, and suggests certain means of remedying that condition. I am having prepared now a statement showing the number of speeches that have been printed as public documents at the request of Senators. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there was one request made, simple as it appeared upon its face, for the printing of a speech as a Senate document, but the result shows that there have been 48 tons of print paper used in the reprinting of that speech that was carried free of cost of postage to the sender.

As soon as I have the information in tabulated form as to the number of speeches and documents, I am going to present it to the Senate of the United States, and then I am going to find out whether or not the Senate wants to save paper. I think the saving ought to begin with the Senate and the House of Representatives, and if it will begin there, then we will have clean hands in asking the newspapers of this country and everybody else to save paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMS, SPOTLIGHT LOVER, WAS BRITAIN'S CATSPAW, ASSERTS NOTED WRITER.

[By James B. Connolly, Boston's noted writer of sea tales, who spent eight months with American naval forces abroad during the Great War and whose comments on Admiral Sims are based on personal observations.]

"BOSTON, January 25.

"Our Navy, according to Admiral Sims, was something of a slacker during the war. Too bad, of course, and yet, as a British born, shouldn't Sims be more grateful? Only for that slacker Navy of ours there would be no British Empire to-day, and with no British Empire and its dire needs there would be no Sims.

SIMS IS COLONIAL BORN.

"Sims is a natural development. First, he is colonial born, and colonials of English descent will fight for empire and royalty long after such things have become a joke in the old country. Secondly, he is a politician; and thirdly, he is a publicity man—publicity for Sims. He is an admiral to-day, one of what they call the indoor admirals; yes; but it is the other three that are and have been the working influences with him.

"It was at a banquet in London in 1910 that Sims arose and said that he, a captain, in the United States Navy, could assure all present that in the event of that war which could not be much longer postponed England's great backer would be the United States.

"They need have no fear when the time came, America's last man, last dollar, last pound of steel would be at England's call.

"This started something. Sims was reprimanded—not too severely—by Washington. Other naval officers wished that somebody would get up a little manual on professional ethics and good taste for the shouters of the Sims type—either that or choke them before they got to the third class, and the laity wanted to know who was this new politician in their Navy, and so on.

"Sims got it right and left, but he knew what he was saying and why he said it. The English propaganda was going good then. There was a German propaganda, too, but as against the force of the British it was as a little brooklet to a great river.

"Students of history speak of England as old and senile, and military men rate the English Tonnie a first-class specimen of a dud on the firing line, but they all must hand it to England for one thing: The finest job of propaganda in the world's history, and put out by England prior to and just after our entry into the war.

"Sims knew what he was doing. Men who could tell him better than anybody in the world just what effect England's propaganda would finally have in this country were right there at that dinner in London while Sims was talking, and Sims was making no mistake.

"All over the English world that speech was quoted, and the name of Sims established as the one American naval officer who could be depended upon to play England's game when the time came.

"And when the time came and English influence put him where he could play it, he played it. And he is playing it right now when he is depreciating the work of our Navy in the war, because to say we did the less is to prove that England did the more.

"Except as an instrument for somebody else's purpose we need not take Sims too seriously. He is a subtle politician and has always been crazy for publicity. We have in our Navy scores of officers who are constantly doing fine things to better the service. The public does not hear of this type, because it is against the ethics of the service for naval officers to tell the public about themselves.

"But the Sims type does not work that way. Some years ago he was one of a group of younger officers who were insistent on the adoption of certain British ideas in gunnery matters. Later the naval battles off Chile, Falkland, and Jutland tended to show that we should have paid more attention to what the

German ideas were; however, every officer I spoke to at that time said the British ideas were good and they were for them.

WHISKERS AND PRESS AGENTS.

"Quite a few of our officers worked hard for better gunnery in our Navy at that time, but the only officer's name that I ever saw in print about it was that of Sims. Even in those days I saw Sims's name so often in print that I once asked two naval friends of mine who his press agent was.

"Later he did have press agents on his staff—I know one of them quite well—but at this time I doubt if he had one regularly with him. He wore a fine set of whiskers, which is all I can remember of his looks then—whiskers when every other naval man in the place was clean shaven—and behind the whiskers an expression as of a man who would wear a nose ring, if need be, to win notice.

"He wore the nose ring later; he is wearing one now.

"The next time I met Sims was in London after he went to war. There were officers who ranked him, and among them several who were better qualified than Sims for the billet for commander in chief of our naval forces in European waters; but the publicity for Sims had been framing up for just this crisis, and it was Sims that Washington sent over.

"Daniels has no use for Sims, nor Sims for Daniels, and naval officers generally are not in love with Sims; then how did he come to get that billet? Somebody could tell that.

GORGEOUS FLUNKY AT DOOR.

"When I first went into the American admiralty in London in 1917 and the door was opened to me, I stepped back on the porch and took a peek up, to make sure it was the American and not the British flag that was over the door.

"Sims's quarters were handy to Buckingham Palace, and I thought for a moment when I was faced by this gorgeous British flunky at the door that I must have gotten into the palace grounds somewhere. Sims heard so much about that gorgeous doorkeeper that later he put an American marine in his place.

"However, there Sims was in London, with a press agency working double tides for him. He was the greatest fellow over there; yes. He had once been in command of the combined British and American fleets, which turned out to be all bunk when I got over there; but it is interesting now, because Sims himself censored American naval news from London, and the bunk about his commanding the British great fleet must have passed through his own hands.

"However, I did think he held some naval authority over there. But the English may tell a man what a great reinsman he is, but they hold the reins themselves always.

"I came with all the needful credentials as a naval correspondent to cruise with the destroyers, but Sims had to tell me—he confessed this in the presence of a witness—that he had no power to put an American correspondent aboard an American destroyer for a cruise in war time. The British Admiral Bayly only could do that.

THE GREAT ADMIRAL BAYLY.

"This Admiral Bayly, who was then in charge of our naval forces, was certainly a fine specimen to put over anybody. It was of Bayly they told the story that early in the war he was called into conference on the U-boat threat. 'U-boats?' said Bayly. 'Gentlemen, it is foolish for anyone to say that the U-boats will ever amount to anything. Disregard them utterly.'

"Fine. It was because the U-boats had them all on the run that our destroyers had to hurry across. But there was old Bayly running our naval show and Sims subordinate to him.

"I have always discounted Sims's professional batting average about 100 points because of the press bureau behind him, but he surely had more brains than Bayly. When an American correspondent arrived at the naval base and Bayly's aid came around to look him over it was not of his professional qualifications that the aid inquired; what the aid wanted to know was how he stood on the Irish question. A fine old moss-back, Bayly, but he was the boss.

"No American destroyer could so much as shift her moorings in Queenstown Harbor without first securing permission of Bayly. When Admiral Wilson took over the command of our naval forces in French waters our fellows took their orders from Wilson and nobody else. Why not from Sims, too? Is it that they did not trust us, or is it that they did not take Sims seriously as an admiral; they made him, yes; but not to be any commanding admiral. Then what?

THAT FAMOUS U-BOAT BATTLE.

"All naval press censorship was in the hands of the British Admiralty, of course, though naval matters from American sources over there were supposed to go through Sims. Early



in the Sims régime came the famous attack on Secretary Daniels's so-called Fourth of July story of the U-boat attack on one of our early convoys. That story was meant to bring Daniels into ridicule, and without stopping to ask where it came from and what was the motive behind it, most of our papers printed it. It is no use for Sims to say to-day that he never saw the dispatch.

"It came to the press in the regular way and no member of Sims's staff would dare to pass it without the boss seeing it. In letting that dispatch go through Sims was disloyal to Daniels, his chief, and disloyalty in wartime is bad business, but somebody over there must have wanted it to go through, so through it went.

"Sims put many a thing through for them over there. A naval officer is supposed to steer clear of political questions. Admiral Bayly devoutly hated the Irish. He ordered an American correspondent to be held two weeks in London one time, because he bore an Irish name, and he did not think it safe to allow a man with such a name to be in Ireland while there was an Irish convention going on there.

"From Queenstown, where Bayly presided, came a fine lot of propaganda against the Irish. It was pure bunk that our gobs did not get along well with the Irish people. The trouble was that our gobs and the Irish got along altogether too well.

#### IRISH GIRLS LIKED OUR BOYS.

"Five months after our first destroyer steamed into Queenstown 48 American bluejackets had taken out licenses to marry Queenstown girls, which is pretty good going for a small force in a few weeks. Gobs on liberty could be seen waving Sinn Féin flags.

"I didn't know that they were all so strong for the Sinn Féiners. It may have been they wanted to show that they had no use for the 'Limie.' There was but little mixing it up in Queenstown between our gobs and the British sailors, the Limies not being in sufficient numbers there to give battles; but elsewhere, with the British predominating, there were constant mix-ups.

"Our gobs may have brought but they did not use knives in fist fights; and more than one of our fellows was found in the gutter with a knife in his back. The American gob loved the English 'Limie' about as well as the American doughboy loved the British Tommie—ask any doughboy how well that is—but according to Sims our fellows and their fellows were the loveliest ever.

"Propaganda always, and Sims always on that job. The British gang of politicians, who were running the British Empire, had every now and then to prove to the public that their selections for big jobs were great men.

#### SAYS JELlicoe WONDERFUL.

"Sims says Admiral Jellicoe was a wonderful man. Jellicoe was put in command of the British great fleet about the same time that the politicians put that other flivver, Gen. French, in command of the British Army in Flanders.

"Jellicoe replaced Admiral Callaghan. I do not know who Callaghan is or was, but his name sounds as if he might at least fight. Didn't Jellicoe fight?

"He has written a 600-page book of what he did in the war. It is a 600-page alibi for 'safety first.'

"He came within range of the enemy with a tremendous superiority of ships, men, and weight of metal over the Germans; and what did he do when he found himself within range? Did he close in and clean up? He did—not.

"What did he do? To put it in his own delicious phrase, he 'opened the range.' To put it in the language of the laity, he increased the distance between himself and the enemy. To put it in the language of the American gob, he beat it. Ran away? Well, what do you think?

"According to tradition, the British Navy is wonderful. Invincible; yes. But here was a mess. Well, they had educated up the public before, and could do it again. And they did. As a result of the propaganda which followed the Jutland fight, there are people over here who think that the British won that fight.

"Every naval man knows that the Germans gave the British an awful walloping at Jutland, and that Jellicoe's part in it was a disgrace, but our Admiral Sims boosts him, and why is that? Does he have to do things like that to hold his place, or what is it?

"Let Jellicoe run away, let French have his joy parties in Flanders, but keep our own gang in power; that seemed to be the war cry of that London gang. 'Let everything happen, we'll fool the public after it happens.' And they were fooling a lot of them, too.

#### THE BRITISH WERE LICKED.

"Six months before we were drawn into the war they were licked, and were hanging on by their toes till we got going, and yet when our fellows went over there they heard on all sides:

"'Now, that we've won the war the Yankees 'ave come.'

"Was it any wonder that wherever any of our fellows were camped in the British Isles they took to going around and beating up 'Limies' and Tommies?

"In England, while the armistice was pending, Sims gave out figures tinctured with that same spirit with which he is now depreciating the work of our Navy in the war. He gave out figures in London in October, 1918, to show how many millions of troops the British escorted safely to France. Great! Across the narrow British Channel, with a solid line both sides to protect them.

"We took our ships across 3,000 miles' stretch with U-boats working both sides without losing a man. Two hundred and odd of our soldiers were lost on the *Tuscania*, but she was under a British, not an American, escort.

#### ANOTHER BANQUET FOR BRITISH.

"Sims gave out figures to show that we were beholden to British ships for getting 66 per cent of our men across. (Incidentally they put in a bill for \$160 per man for that service, which price we cut in two when we settled the bill.)

"But where is the 66 per cent when Washington has officially declared that our own ships took over 46 per cent and that French and Italian ships also took some?

"Why does he say such things? He told in print of the hundreds and hundreds of British-war craft he calls them—engaged in the war defense, and compares the magnificent total to the few scores we had over there—ours amounted to 3 per cent, or something like that, of theirs.

"But he does not say that every ship we sent over was a live unit, and that hundreds and hundreds of the British craft were ridiculous little things that could not leave the harbor in any kind of blow. Mounted with 1-pounder guns in the bows many of them were, and with a sea chop 3 feet high they could not fire a shell and say, half the time, would it hit the sky or be dumped in the swash alongside.

#### SIMS DISLOYAL TO DANIELS.

"He does not emphasize the fact that the great lines of sea traffic converging in the Bay of Biscay, the English Channel, and the south entrance to the Irish Sea were guarded by our fellows, and that that work, combined with the work of laying the great mine barrage in the North Sea—80 per cent of it laid by our Navy—was what broke the U-boat back.

"No; he does not say that, and why not?

"Sims was disloyal to Secretary Daniels in war time and he is disloyal to him now. His admiralty headquarters in London were rotten with the backcapping of Daniels.

"He says now that Daniels should have taken more destroyers from the guardianship of our own coast and sent them over to help him. He says that notwithstanding that it was the London gang behind Sims who spread the propaganda early that if we did not go over there and help lick Germany, then Germany would be over here to lick us. But now he says there was never any danger to our shores.

"Perhaps there never was, and yet at this time when Daniels thought a few destroyers would do no harm along our own coast, the U-boats were working, had been working, and it was a fair judgment to say they might continue to work for another while on this side.

#### GRAVE PERIL IN ARMCHAIRS.

"Sims right now is telling the public that our seagoing Navy did not do so much. The great work was done by him in London. Of course, our men did fairly well at sea, but what is that? And they probably did that because they did not know any better; if they knew better, they would have got billets where their greatest danger would be of getting splinters in the seat of their trousers from revolving too carelessly in office chairs.

"Distinguished-service medals for the commander of a destroyer which was torpedoed with a loss of 60 of his 100 men in two minutes. Tut, tut; pooh, pooh!

"Such things are accidents. No matter how well he behaved afterwards? No matter; still an accident.

"But D. S. M.'s. Oh, yes! for the brave chaps who were dining with the King, running around to music halls in London, and posing, sometimes an hour at a stretch, for the movie cameras.

"Why does he say and do those things? Well, he is British born. Have you ever met the kind of British born who never becomes a good American? It is pretty hard to shift a real

Englishman. His sense of racial superiority is his religion. Our Army and Navy saved England from being a German Province, and she knows it and will never forgive us for it.

"But it is not the British born alone. We have with us right now some American born who are something else first and American second. And they are a real menace.

"I was over there when Sims brought to a big dinner in London one of our best-selling little novelists as his guest. Winston Churchill is his name, and at the proper moment Mr. Churchill arose and said:

"Let me assure you gentlemen here to-night that there is not one American citizen but who stands ready to shed the last drop of his blood before he will see the British Empire go down."

#### THE GLORY OF BRITAIN.

"How is that? Does it sound like an echo from Sims at a dinner in the same place in 1910? It was printed with acclaim in the London daily papers next day.

"It may be fine reading for the gob at the naval base, too. I was in Our Men's Club in Queenstown when some of them read it.

"Great! We thought we came over here to make the world safe for democracy, but it is to save the British Empire, is it? Great!"

"The glory of Britain—that's the game. And every belittling of what we did in the war is a magnification of what Britain did. And Britain having done it all, why should she not by and by grab all she cares to grab? Why not? Hasn't she earned it? And planted away in nearly all our big dailies and many of our periodicals are advocates of that idea.

"And they are the one biggest menace to Americanism to-day. With them it is the knife—sometimes openly, sometimes from out of the dark—for whoever dares to advocate otherwise. But, hallelujah for those who talk right.

"And so to hell with the American Navy! To hell with American prestige! All up for the empire! Hallelujah for the Simses!"

#### ADDRESS BY JOHN J. MAHONEY.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of the remarks of John J. Mahoney, supervisor of Americanization work under the department of education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, before a group of educational workers.

Massachusetts has already been undertaking this work very vigorously and has appointed an enthusiastic and able young man as State supervisor of this work and appropriated a substantial sum of money for the same. The views of Mr. Mahoney on this question are most interesting, and I deem them worthy of insertion in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[Remarks of John J. Mahoney, supervisor of Americanization work under the department of education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, before a group of educational workers.]

#### PUTTING AMERICA INTO AMERICANIZATION.

"The teaching of English to immigrants is the first step in the Americanization of those immigrants. But what is Americanization? Stripped of all beclouding verbiage, it is simply the business of making Americans. It is the business of instilling into the heart of everyone who inhabits American soil those ideas and ideals, those attitudes, convictions, and points of view that the real American believes in and swears by and reveres. But what are they, these things of the American spirit? Americanization is the business of making good citizens. But who is the good citizen? Americanization is the business of making these United States safe for democracy. But what is democracy?"

"Very, very hurriedly and with the most abject apologies for the doctrinaire tone that this haste compels me to assume I am going to answer these question for the purpose of pointing out things that teachers, in my experience, give little evidence of knowing, but which they must know if they are really to Americanize.

"Democracy is a state of human relationship which, generally speaking, does not exist in the world to-day. It is only approximated. For the purpose of clearness we make speak of it as having three aspects; three fields in which it operates:

"(1) Political democracy is best set forth in Lincoln's phrase—a government of the people, by the people, for the people. It carries with it the connotation of rights and opportunities, duties and obligations. We have a considerable measure of this type of democracy in the United States.

"(2) Social democracy—I use the term as the best that occurs to me—is an affirmation of Burns's stirring challenge, 'A man's a man for a' that.' It denies an aristocracy either of birth or wealth. It recognizes an aristocracy of worth and fineness of

spirit only. We can stand in actual practice considerably more of this type of democracy in the United States to-day.

"(3) Industrial democracy is a demand that wealth, which is produced by the cooperation of capital, labor, and the skill of the 'entrepreneur,' be distributed more equitably among those several agents. Unrestrained capitalism is answered by unrestrained Bolshevism. Industrial democracy, the doctrine of the economic 'square deal,' is the safe middle-of-the-road policy which points the way to the economic uplift and the enduring happiness of society as a whole.

"And what are our American ideas, ideals, and points of view? Despite the fact that our America is yet an imperfect thing, despite the fact that thousands of American citizens give the lie in their lives and in their practices to the principles we profess in moments of exaltation, there are certain things that America stands for foursquare to the winds of the world. We know this country for the land of opportunity. We believe that citizenship means duties and obligations as well as rights and privileges. We believe that equality means not a leveling, but the right and the chance for every man to develop the utmost that is in him for the common good. We believe in a representative form of government and in a wise choice of capable leaders. We are committed to the principle of majority rule. We stand for voluntary obedience to lawful authority. And we hold to the conviction that while we keep God in our hearts America endures.

"Do our teachers teach these things? Hardly. In our advanced classes we teach history and citizenship, indeed. But practically every text in civics or citizenship is either a story of the functions of our Government or a dry-as-dust catechism on our Federal Constitution, which does not touch the immigrant's daily life by the margin of a 10-foot pole. And our history is taught as in the day schools, the concatenated story of past events, as if a knowledge of history or a knowledge of civics, either, ever made a good citizen.

"Do not misunderstand me. Knowledge of history and of civics is an important factor in the teaching of Americanism. But the inculcation of an enthusiasm for Americanism is better; and this enthusiasm is not engendered by the type of the texts now used. Better even than enthusiasm is the opportunity for participation. I liked what Mr. Goldberger said yesterday about the socialized evening school. A man learns to be a good citizen by being a good citizen. The socialized evening school gives him a chance to exercise those habits and traits and attitudes of citizenship which mark the citizen worth while; and I offer the suggestion that if history were taught in the evening schools in this same dynamic fashion it would approximate more closely the end it is supposed to serve. History is a subject that surely more than all others should be the medium for instruction in citizenship, but it can not fulfill this function until schools everywhere and evening schools in particular cease teaching history merely as the record of past events. History is valuable mainly for the light it throws on present-day problems. It should be taught not for its facts but for its values. If I were a director of evening schools, as I was for a good many years, I should begin a course of study in history for advanced classes not with the year 1492 or 1776 but with the year 1919. My classes would study, for instance, 'The meaning and worth of liberty.' Consider the investigation of this problem, beginning, if you please, in the year 1919 with an analysis of liberty, autocracy, license, Bolshevism as these concepts can be interpreted in the light of the student's reactions and opinions. The past is then called upon to tell the story of liberty—just that—how it was won for America and what it has cost us in blood and sacrifice and treasure. The lesson would be the incalculable value of it and the sacredness of the gift handed down to the citizens of a present-day generation. Similarly an investigation of 'Democracy and its problems,' illumined by the story of the slow advance that democracy records, would give students a background for understanding not only the ultimate inevitability of democracy but its perils as well. Such treatment, in my opinion, makes history a very purposive study indeed; and the purpose, the goal, is the teaching of citizenship. No other purpose is worth the time expended.

"I must stop. Have I made clear what I mean by putting Americanism into Americanization? Boiled down, it means that after the language barrier has been swept away the teacher must be able to interpret America to the immigrant in terms not of information alone but in terms of ideas and ideals, of convictions, attitudes, and points of view. To do this properly she must know her America, its lights and shadows, its successes and weaknesses, its groping yesterdays and its promising to-morrows. To do it properly she must know how to use her teaching materials in a dynamic way. Teacher trainers



for the problem of Americanization must look upon this as their most vital task. If you get this thought from what I have tried to say this morning, then my discussion has not failed too abjectly."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

#### PREVENTION OF INFLUENZA.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration Senate joint resolution 76, Order of Business No. 199. It is a joint resolution which I think it is imperative to have passed at once.

I ask that the joint resolution be read, together with a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relating thereto.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask whether the joint resolution is on the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. FRANCE. It is Order of Business No. 199.

Mr. KING. Let it be read, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I take it for granted that that is the joint resolution which appropriates a million dollars for the investigation and prevention of influenza.

Mr. FRANCE. Yes; it is.

Mr. KING. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. FRANCE. I hope the Senator will allow the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury to be read before he objects. The Public Health Service is entirely without funds for meeting a very serious situation, a threatened epidemic; and I feel that the Senator should at least hear the joint resolution and the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury read before objecting. Will the Senator kindly withdraw his objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will withhold the objection until I hear the letter to which the Senator refers; but I think we ought to proceed with the calendar before taking up this bill. This is Calendar Monday, and we should not displace the calendar. Upon the conclusion of the hour devoted to it, I shall not object to the Senator moving to take up his measure.

Mr. FRANCE. I appreciate the feeling of the Senator; but we may not reach this joint resolution to-day on the calendar, and I think it would be very unwise to let several days elapse before we take action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 24, 1920.

HON. JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FRANCE: From all indications a recrudescence of last year's epidemic of influenza is now imminent. Influenza is already present in epidemic form in New York, Chicago, and other large centers of population. Its rapid spread from these centers to all parts of the country seems highly probable in view of the natural history of influenza epidemics.

Owing to the seriousness of the situation allow me to invite your attention to the urgent necessity for providing, at an early date, funds for the investigation of the cause, mode of transmission, and means of prevention of influenza and allied diseases, as provided by Senate joint resolution No. 76, now on the Senate Calendar. Some action is urgent at this time because up to the present time we are without specific knowledge as to preventive measures. The epidemic fund, in which influenza is included, is practically exhausted because of the expenditures made in controlling the outbreak of bubonic plague in New Orleans.

May I ask you, as chairman of the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine of the Senate, to take such steps as you may deem expedient to meet the situation?

Cordially, yours,

CARTER GLASS,  
Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not understand the particular need for the appropriation that has been suggested, but I do know that this is a matter that has been under discussion for some time. Early in the summer I wrote to the Surgeon General, asking what steps had been taken or what means were being employed to prevent a recurrence of the epidemic of the "flu." I can conceive of nothing of more importance than the application of all proper means to the prevention of this disease. The Surgeon General informed me that they were working at it as far as the funds that were appropriated for that purpose would permit. I think it would be a crime to refuse this appropriation if in fact it would prevent the spread of this disease or mitigate its ravages.

I am not familiar with the particular needs of the Health Service. I know it asks for aid. I am not sure that good will come from the expenditure, but I hope it will. I must necessarily rely upon men who are familiar with this matter. We can not well afford to neglect a matter of this importance, because we all know the devastation which was wrought in this

country last year and what now threatens. It would be wiser to err in expending money than in neglecting human life.

As I said, I am not prepared to speak with authority as to the necessity of an appropriation of \$1,000,000. I think I am prepared to support any measure which may reasonably promise relief or safety in the present emergency, which is serious. The object, of course, is to benefit men and women instead of hogs or cotton, although I submit that ought to weaken its support.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of this joint resolution. I have been one of the victims of the influenza myself, and just got out of a sick bed to come to the session to-day in order to vote against the so-called Americanization bill.

I do object to the constant encroachments of the Public Health Service organization. It has bureaus, not one dozen but several dozen, which are attempting to invade the States and usurp their powers and authority and discharge the responsibilities resting upon them. A mighty army of employees has been created, and a Nation-wide plan is being developed under which the lives and health of the people will be placed under Federal control. We will soon have the United States furnishing doctors and nurses and hospitals for all the people, with the consequent result of hundreds of millions of dollars being taken annually from the people.

I picked up on a Senator's desk a moment ago the Christian Science Monitor for January 23, and I read in the editorial—and let me say that I have found the statements of this paper to be reliable, and it is one of the best newspapers in the United States—these words:

At the invitation of the State department of health, it seems, the United States Public Health Service is to make a State-wide survey. One of the first steps in the investigation is to be a house-to-house canvass. A physician and a public-health nurse are to call at each house where there are children who have not yet gone to school. School children will also be examined so thoroughly that a card index of their health histories can be made. The whole crusade is for the purpose of inducing each community, not only in Missouri but everywhere else in the country, to make this work permanent. In other words, this one State is to be made, for the present, a great experimental laboratory for the purpose of suggesting to the populace the latest theories. Truly, parents and children alike will need to keep wide awake in order to avoid being imposed on.

This modern imposition and inquisition shows how all the seemingly slight and harmless encroachments of schemers for this sort of thing are now being coordinated and extended as people 10 years ago would hardly have dreamed would ever be possible.

And so on, through a very interesting editorial.

That merely illustrates what the Federal Government is doing. The so-called Americanization bill is simply one of the symptoms of this deadly and destructive disease which is taking possession of the country. The Federal Government must go into the States; if there is a little outbreak of so-called un-Americanism, the Federal Government must interfere; if there is a little illiteracy in some precinct, the Federal Government must interfere; if there is any ill to which flesh is heir or society is subject, the Federal Government must interfere; if some disease manifests itself which physicians are dealing with in a scientific and rational way, the Federal Government must interfere. You will always find cranks and faddists in the Federal Government service, and ambitious persons holding Federal positions, anxious to extend their authority and augment their prestige and power, who will seize upon these sporadic conditions as an excuse for demanding immense appropriations and creating additional Federal machinery.

Here we have in the editorial to which I have referred an exemplification of this powerful tendency. The Federal Government, through this health service, is to go into the States, take a card index of the children, ascertain their infantile complaints, find out whether they are teething or whether they have the croup, how the teeth may be best cut and the croup may be best avoided. It assumes the utter incapacity of the people to deal with their own affairs or the States and local communities and the doctors and hospitals and the people to meet the duties and responsibilities resting upon them. The people are to be treated as hothouse plants and a heavy-handed bureaucracy is to control and direct their lives and activities. Of course, the program calls for hundreds of thousands of additional Federal employees. Soon there will be but two classes—those working for the Government and those paying taxes to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, this joint resolution offered by the Senator from Maryland is in line with this theory that the Federal Government must put its hands into the States, control their health, control their schools, control their public welfare, and discharge the police functions of the States themselves. I do not know how many millions of dollars have been given to the Public Health Service. I do not know how many bureaus or agencies or divisions there are within it. I know that the senior Senator

from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] gave some attention to that matter some months ago and obtained figures as to the large appropriations made. Millions of dollars have been given to this organization, and it still wants more, and if you give it this million dollars it will want five million. Indeed, the joint resolution, as I see, called for \$5,000,000, but the committee recommended an amendment reducing the amount to \$1,000,000.

If we were to leave to executive agencies the question of the amount to be expended by them, they would tax the people to the point of destruction and provoke a revolution. There would be no limit to the inordinate demands and the ambitious schemes which they would make and project. The Public Health Service Bureau of the United States has become a huge organization and a powerful bureaucracy; it is crying for more power and larger appropriations; it is becoming an oppressive paternalism, and will soon be a meddlesome, offensive, and, indeed, dangerous force in the Nation.

I see no necessity for this measure. I shall not object to its consideration, but at the appropriate time I shall move to cut down the appropriation to \$500,000, and unless further reason appears for its passage shall vote against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland what amount of money was appropriated last year?

Mr. FRANCE. I think it was about \$1,500,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, can the Senator state what good was done with that money, what advance in science was made by the use of it?

Mr. FRANCE. The officers of the Public Health Service feel that a considerable amount of information was gained with reference to the nature and spread of influenza. Unfortunately the causes have not been fully determined, nor has the nature of the disease been fully ascertained; but the study of the disease, I think, should go on. I feel that it is most important that at least some sum be placed at the disposal of the Public Health Service at this time to pursue the investigation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that when we come to the matter of spending a million dollars, after having expended a million and one-half last year for the purpose, we ought not to vote until we know what was done with the million and a half and what was accomplished. It is too important a matter for us to expend another million dollars on without knowing what results were obtained from the expenditure of the first million and a half. Of course, this disease will be studied; it is being studied; but it is easy enough to waste a million or a million and a half dollars if it is not carefully looked after by Congress, and it is not being carefully looked after by Congress if it simply votes the money without knowing what has been done with what was appropriated last year.

Mr. NORRIS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not able to give the Senator the information directly that he has asked for, but I believe only a portion of the money that was appropriated last year was used for the study of the "flu." I understand it was under some such general term as "contagious diseases," and a great deal of it was used for the investigation of other diseases. However, I may be wrong about that.

Mr. FRANCE. A very large proportion of the fund was used for the prevention of the spread of the bubonic plague in New Orleans.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would like to ask the Senator if the joint resolution could not go over for a few days until he can procure from the Public Health Service a statement, for the benefit of the Senate, as to what they have done with the money and what they have accomplished by its use?

Mr. FRANCE. I must say, in answer to the Senator, that I sympathize very much with the position which he takes. If I had my way I would insist that every department to which an appropriation was made for investigation purposes should make a report upon the findings at the time of asking for an additional appropriation. I think that is sound public policy.

At the same time, I do feel that this is an emergency measure, and that some sum of money should be placed immediately at the disposal of the Public Health Service, even though the sum may be smaller than that provided in the joint resolution, in order that the work may go on; and then we could ascertain more fully as to the uses to which the fund was put last year before appropriating a larger sum. I hope the Senator will allow at least some appropriation to be made by the immediate passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The trouble is that the money is put at the disposal of this bureau to use practically in its own discretion. It has made no report as to what it did last year, as far as I can ascertain, and I think that is a very reckless way for Congress to legislate. We should at least first have a definite report as to what was done last year and what was accomplished by the use of the money.

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee on Appropriations appropriated \$400,000, not only for an investigation into the causes of the "flu" but of other diseases of an epidemic nature.

During the meeting of the committee in which this request was made, Gen. Blue, of the Public Health Service, made a statement to the committee as to how the money had been spent. It was spent in the different States of the Union, and a portion of it went to Alaska. They sent experts, as they claimed, into the principal cities of the country in which the "flu" was raging. I think I am well within the bounds when I say that nothing particular has been discovered as to the cause of the disease by those investigations, but they have at least instructed the people that the patient must keep warm and must be properly fed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say, for the benefit of those who are making this investigation, that I was told by a judge of a superior court that in the mountain country of North Carolina they have discovered a remedy for this disease. They say that common baking soda will cure the disease; that they have cured it with it; that they have no deaths up there at all; and they use common baking soda, which cures the disease.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say, Mr. President, that the joint resolutions originally introduced proposed to appropriate \$5,000,000. The committee saw fit to cut the amount to \$1,000,000, and I think perhaps the suggestion is a good one now made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] that a smaller amount be made immediately available, so that they can begin the investigation of the causes and prevention of the disease in some of the large centers that are at present afflicted with the "flu." I believe that \$250,000 is all that the Senate ought to appropriate at this time, and in the meantime perhaps we can find out something about what the result of the past investigation has been.

Mr. KING. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact, I would like to ask my colleague, that to-day in the medical laboratories of our country there is being made a study of influenza, as there is of cancer and of other diseases, and that the most far-reaching results are being obtained by the scientific study which is being made by the devoted men who are giving their lives to the study of these questions, and that without aid from the Federal Government?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it, Mr. President. I can not see why the Public Health Service can not do this work and pay for same out of the original appropriation as well as to pay for the work referred to by my colleague. What Senator or what Representative thought that he was voting for an appropriation authorizing the Public Health Service to go into the State of Missouri, as was just referred to by my colleague, and referred to by me on the floor of the Senate over a month ago, to care for the teeth of every school child in Missouri and to see if their ears need attention and if their eyes are affected in any way? Mind you, it is not only to make an investigation, but they are to remain there, and the school children are to be treated by the officials of the Government of the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Missouri is only to be an ensample. It is to spread from Missouri to every State in the Union, and nobody can tell what the appropriation will be if that is undertaken.

So if we are going to do this work at all, I hope that the Senator having the joint resolution in charge will not insist upon an appropriation of more than \$250,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has indicated that he would assent to such a change in the joint resolution, and I suggest that we get it out of the way.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I am willing.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I shall not object to whatever the Senator from Maryland, who has charge of the joint resolution, may consent to, but when I consider that here was an unknown disease which destroyed in a very few months more men and women in the United States than were lost in the Great War on the part of the United States during the time we were engaged in it, when I think of the appalling condition which threatens us to-day, and then consider that we are asking for a million dollars that the department of the Government



with which we have trusted at least the health condition of the country may make this investigation, I think that we are now haggling, as laymen, as to whether they can accomplish anything or not, or whether possibly they have proceeded as we, as laymen, would ask them to proceed. It seems to me that we are entirely technical. I shall not argue and spend the time of the Senate, if these wise gentlemen want to stop this appropriation, because we ourselves have neglected to provide the means for reports from the Public Health Service in the past. If you want to do it, I shall not object to it, but as far as I am concerned, sir, I think it is a duty we owe this country to take advantage of such means as can be employed to preserve the public health from this great scourge which, I repeat, has killed more people than were killed in the Great War so far as America is concerned.

I would like all the information that Senators desire. I took this matter up early, because I felt then it was the duty of the Public Health Service to investigate and see what could be done. I think they have been reasonably active. It may be that they have not accomplished direct results—that is, results which have ended the plague—but they have made some advance, and the Senator from Utah, I imagine, if he could preserve his own life or the life of one of his children by the Government spending a million dollars would not object to its being done. I do not know whether it can be prevented or not, but I think this is a sensible thing to do, when the Secretary of the Treasury and the Public Health Service ask that it be done.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, my experience is that the activities of the Federal Government are never very valuable, either along the line of public health or anything else. The fact that some Cabinet officer or some other official of the Government has made a recommendation for an appropriation never comes with any very appealing force to me. I know the incompetency and inefficiency of many of the men in high official position, and I know the grasping desire of officials of the Government in executive departments to extend their authority and their power. It is anything for appropriations, and they will talk about the old flag and an appropriation as long as they can get appropriations out of Congress.

Mr. President, on the 1st of October, 1918, we appropriated a million dollars for this particular purpose, "to enable the Public Health Service to combat and suppress Spanish influenza and other communicable diseases by aiding State and local boards of health, or otherwise, including pay and allowance of medical and sanitary personnel, medical and hospital supplies, printing, and clerical services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere." Of course, you must take care of the new offices that will be created and the new rooms that must be furnished. We appropriated a million dollars. What became of the million dollars? What is there to show for it? What benefit has been derived? Where is the report?

Those questions, Mr. President, have not been answered, and I doubt whether they can be satisfactorily answered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, in my own State during the prevalence of the influenza last year, when, on account of the conditions of the war, a great many of our physicians had been taken into the service, leaving almost an inadequate number, the influenza, when it struck our State, struck us unprepared, because of the fact that we did not have a sufficient number of men trained and of medical skill, and the doctors themselves, as the Senator knows, were among the first victims of the disease.

When it reached its acute stage in my State, I stand here today to testify that the Federal medical service was of incalculable benefit in providing the means of abating it. They cooperated with the local authorities in getting physicians, in providing nurses, in giving directions as to isolation, and in what little treatment was given, because the Senator knows none of them knew exactly what was the etiology of the disease. The germ had never been isolated. The disease was of such national character and the scourge was so great and appalling that I think it justifies the Federal Government in taking cognizance of it and doing all that it can to stamp it out or even to ameliorate its ravages.

I do not know how much money is needed; I do not know whether or not the Public Health Service have been in a position where they could make a report as to what they did with the other million dollars, but I do know that in my State they were of great benefit to the people. This scourge, as was indicated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Townsend], is so appalling in its nature that if it regains its virility it means that which is equivalent to the devastation of war.

I do not know whether a million dollars or two million are needed, but I do know that in the face of the suffering of the

people throughout the country it can not be absorbed by local communities.

I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. King] that where there occurs an unfortunate condition the local communities ought to be allowed to absorb it if possible. I deplore this tendency to run to Congress for relief from every little misfortune that may occur, but when it is as national in scope as this, and as terrible in its effects, if there is anything that justifies cooperation in the work of the whole United States in a governmental capacity to meet it, this is one. There is hardly a home that is not visited now by this miserable disease, and I do not think it is a time for us to question the experts who come and ask that we do something to help the public at large.

Some of those who are on the committee may have heard the evidence; I do not know what disposition was made of the other money, but I do know that it is our duty to meet this situation as we may. Whether the present joint resolution is the correct one or not, it is the best information we have. The committee has already cut the appropriation from \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000, and it seems to me it is our duty to put the funds at the command of the Public Health Service, so that they can do the best they may in the appalling circumstances that confront us.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is undoubtedly a great deal of wisdom and sound sense in what the Senator from Utah [Mr. King] has said in regard to the control of appropriations and in regard to the method that is often pursued in coming to the Federal Government for assistance when States or localities could take care of the situation; but the "flu" does not pay any attention to a State line nor to the line of a municipality. You can not expect any State to accomplish the proper results by stamping it out within any particular locality. The Government ought to prevent its spread.

It is true that much money has already been spent and perhaps not very great results have been obtained. I think they have obtained some, but it is something that neither the medical fraternity nor anyone else understands; it is something new, and we are confronted with the condition and are helpless. If we want to do anything we must go somewhere and trust somebody with the power and authority and equip them with the money to carry out what men who have studied the question think is the proper method to pursue.

It is true, also, that the entire million dollars might be spent and no result come from it; but that is not any reason why we should remain idle when people are dying all over the country. Mr. President, when a child gets sick and you employ a physician, you do not expect him to guarantee a recovery before you employ him to go and see the sick child. We are more or less helpless; the doctors are more or less helpless. But because they have not found a definite and sure remedy or cure for this disease, is that any reason why we should remain idle and allow it to sweep the country with its death-dealing effect in every community and in almost every home? We can not say that anything definite is going to come out of it, but is there any other course that we can pursue that is better than the one proposed here? We have to rely, as we always do in case of sickness, upon somebody who is probably better able to understand conditions than we are.

It seems to me that in this case, where there is a national epidemic, where there is a great danger of an enormous death rate, we ought not to expect localities to handle it. They are doing all they can. The cities are doing all they can. It has been stated that a good many doctors worked hard and devoted a great deal of time without pay. They will do that again. They are doing that now. They are all studying the question. If we can help anywhere by Federal aid we ought to do it in a proposition that is not local but national; yes, Mr. President, it is world-wide. We know what happened in the past, and we are confronted again now, right at our doors to-day, with a proposition, it seems to me, which demands that immediately we shall do all we can in every way that we can, and I do not know of any other way that we can do our share except the way that is proposed by the joint resolution.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee that considered the joint resolution, I desire to say that the committee did come to the conclusion that a million dollars was the minimum amount which should be appropriated for this purpose. Of course, rather than have no appropriation at all I would prefer to see the joint resolution amended so that only \$250,000 might be made available, but I do feel that a million dollars is immediately needed for carrying on the work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that the regular appropriation bill, which would naturally carry an

appropriation for this purpose, will be considered by the House of Representatives very shortly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The epidemic will be over by that time.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, then they can not spend \$1,000,000; \$250,000 would be all that could be spent before the regular appropriation bill is under consideration. In the meantime there is no question but what an appropriation for this purpose will be included in the regular appropriation bill, while this \$250,000 is an emergency matter. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] knows that the Public Health Service can not, within the next two months at least, get any kind of an organization together and spend more than \$250,000. It was for that reason that I said I think, this being an emergency matter, there should not be any more appropriated than enough to carry out the emergency requirements. That is why I suggested \$250,000 to the Senator. I think that will be all we ought to appropriate at this time under conditions as they exist to-day. If the Senator has no objection, I shall offer an amendment to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. FRANCE. I think that at least half a million ought to be the minimum, but in view of what the Senator says I would rather have \$250,000 appropriated than none at all.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in justice to the Public Health Service, I desire to make a statement. It has been stated that the Senate would like to know how the former appropriation has been spent. I hold in my hand the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States, which is very interesting and a very able report, showing how the money was spent and some of the great work that was done by this service. So it will not do to say that we have no report.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does the report show what work was done during the influenza epidemic?

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly. It is a very interesting report, undoubtedly, although I have not had time to read it; but I say that it is here, filling a good many pages, showing how the money was spent. It is accessible to anyone who desires to read it. It has been said that there was no report, and I merely wished to correct that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there any objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PHELAN. I object.

Mr. FRANCE. I think the joint resolution was before the Senate. It is my understanding that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] withdrew his objection, and that the joint resolution has been before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator from Maryland is right. My recollection is that the Chair submitted the matter, and upon assurance, as I understood it, from my friend the Senator from Maryland that an amendment reducing the amount would not be opposed, I withdrew the objection, and it has been considered by the Senate. It is my understanding that the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. PHELAN. I move the reference of the joint resolution to the appropriate committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It has just been reported from the committee.

Mr. PHELAN. I think the Senate is without exact information that the money appropriated last year was not spent in a manner to accomplish any result, and that the epidemic was not stayed by any action on the part of Congress; that the hospitals of the country through their laboratories are seeking a remedy and have not found it, and I can not conceive how the epidemic may be stopped by the methods of the Public Health Service, which consisted, I am told, of sending physicians to different States. Of course, physicians are available without the aid of the Public Health Service.

I had some experience with the epidemic last year, and the only means of helping those who are suffering was by giving them nursing. How an appropriation can create a nursing corps adequate to meet the emergency I am not aware. All the nurses available were employed during that epidemic, and I think that without reference to the appropriate committee, with some definite plan proposed by which the epidemic could be stayed and the Senate so advised, that it would be vain and purposeless to make this appropriation at this time.

Of course, there is no question of retrenchment if the service can be rendered; but I am much concerned in knowing how the appropriation of last year was expended. The committee could also report to us upon that subject.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask the reference of the joint resolution to the appropriate committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was just about to ask the Senator what he considers the appropriate committee? This is the report of a committee. The joint resolution has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. PHELAN. I was not advised that it came from a committee. I thought it was a motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It has been reported and is on the calendar now, having been reported by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] on the 1st of October, 1919.

Mr. NORRIS. And it has been upon the calendar ever since.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It has been upon the calendar for a long time.

Mr. PHELAN. Then had the Senator anticipated the epidemic?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say that if the Senate had anticipated it, as we ought to have anticipated it, the epidemic probably would not have come. We ought to have passed this joint resolution before the epidemic was on us. It is on us now; and it seems to me the appropriation ought to be made to assist the staying of it, if possible, and to find some remedy for it.

It has been charged here that the Federal authorities are incompetent to deal with this or any kindred subject. As a matter of fact, the Federal authorities discovered the origin of yellow fever; they found an antidote for it and a cure for it; and they have prevented a terrible disaster visiting the American people every year, because they have ascertained a way to stop it.

Mr. President, I have an idea that the influenza is due to some germ, just as the yellow fever is due to some germ, and when that germ is discovered that it will be possible to abate that terrible disease. I have seen Congress, without batting an eye, appropriate \$500,000 for the eradication of hog cholera, but whenever it comes to the protection of human life there is always a fight and an assertion that we ought not to appropriate money for such purposes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. NUGENT. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a few days ago I read in the newspapers a statement given to the press by a Government doctor who is connected with the Great Lakes Training Station, in which he asserted without qualification that he had discovered the germ of influenza. That being true, I do not doubt that in a comparatively short time the remedy also will be discovered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I feel there is no question about it, Mr. President. It is true that the local physicians do their best to try to cure the influenza. I called on a physician this morning to go to see a young friend of mine who has the influenza, and he told me he was absolutely overwhelmed with calls and that it was impossible for him even to accept an invitation to see an additional patient.

The bureau, established for the purpose, can devote its entire time not to visiting patients but to the discovery of the cause of the disease, while the local physicians are compelled to treat the individual patients, without much regard to the source of the epidemic.

I think, Mr. President, the joint resolution ought to be passed, and, if possible, some antidote found for the disease which carried away so many hundreds of thousands of people during the last year and which was more disastrous to our troops in the United States who were in the cantonments than were the bullets of the Germans in Europe.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, when I addressed the Senate I understood that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] had made a motion to appropriate \$1,000,000 to be disbursed by the Public Health Service. I see now that the joint resolution which was introduced as long ago as July 24, 1919, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] was reported by the Senator from Maryland favorably providing for an appropriation of \$1,000,000. The joint resolution provides that the several universities and hospitals of the country be encouraged by the distribution of the fund in their efforts to discover the germ of influenza and, possibly, to protect the country from future epidemics. I think that the great universities of the country and their laboratories have been at work, without any aid from Congress, because there are great endowed funds for this purpose.

This is an emergency measure. The best way of rendering immediate relief would be some method by which the fund could be made available for the employment of nurses. There is no way of meeting the emergency by doctors' prescriptions, and the doctors themselves admit that nursing is essential for the cure of the disease. I think the joint resolution should be so amended as to give some practical utility for such a large expenditure. I think a million dollars for the employment of



nurses, distributed throughout the States where the infection exists, would be too small. I should be in favor of a larger appropriation if its use is wisely planned. There was \$5,000,000 appropriated in this joint resolution as originally introduced. If that money is used in research, I think it would be of no present value. If it shall be used for a practical purpose, it might be of very great service. I therefore move to recommit the joint resolution to the committee in order that they may report some adequate and proper plan for the expenditure of the appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported to the joint resolution by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Health and Quarantine was, in section 1, page 2, line 18, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$5,000,000" and to insert "\$1,000,000," so as to read:

That to enable the Public Health Service to investigate influenza and allied diseases in order to discover their causes and to prevent their spread, and for allotment of sums to universities, colleges, or other suitable research institutions, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering their causes and methods of prevention, in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and including pay and allowances of regular and reserve commissioned medical and sanitary personnel, and for medical and hospital supplies, printing, clerical services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, transportation, freight, and such other expenses as may be necessary, including the dissemination of such information to the public, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, available until expended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Maryland, when I withdrew my objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution, to consent to a reduction of the proposed appropriation to \$500,000.

Mr. FRANCE. The Senator from Utah is correct. I did consent to that reduction. I consented to the reduction of the sum to \$500,000 in order that that sum might be immediately available. I shall not oppose such an amendment.

Mr. KING. Then I move that the committee amendment be amended so that the sum appropriated shall be \$500,000. I shall be very glad to vote for a small appropriation if some other Senator will move an amendment to my amendment. In not objecting to the consideration of the bill I did not commit myself to its support or to oppose a reduction of the \$500,000 appropriation to a smaller sum.

Mr. SMOOT. Such an amendment would not be in order, because it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. KING. I will withdraw my amendment if some other Senator will offer an amendment reducing the sum below what I have proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Personally, I agree with the Senator from Maryland that \$1,000,000 is not too much for the proposed purpose; I am in favor of the appropriation of \$1,000,000; but I am willing to carry out the understanding of the Senator from Utah that he withdrew his objection, when he had an opportunity to prevent the consideration of the joint resolution, on condition that the Senator from Maryland would agree to reduce the sum proposed to be appropriated to \$500,000. However, it also seems to me that the Senator from Utah now should stand by his agreement, the same as the Senator from Maryland has done, and should assist us in retaining the appropriation of \$500,000, and should oppose any amendment to reduce the appropriation below that sum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And if he does not we can then make a fight for an appropriation of \$1,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that he would prefer to have \$250,000—

Mr. NORRIS. He would prefer that to nothing.

Mr. SMOOT. I intended to finish my sentence. Of course, I do not want to be understood as trying to misrepresent the Senator from Maryland, because I had no such thought in my mind. I was about to say that the Senator from Maryland said he would rather have an appropriation of \$250,000 than not to have an appropriation at all, if by reducing it to that amount it would insure the passage of the joint resolution. I wish to move an amendment making the amount \$250,000, for the reasons already stated by me. A greater amount can not be spent before the regular appropriation bill comes along. If the "flu" should cease within a short time, there would be no necessity for any further appropriation; but I will assure the Senate of the United States that if \$5,000,000 were appropriated, even though the "flu" should subside and there should not remain a

single case of it in the entire United States, the entire \$5,000,000 would be expended.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Even though the "flu" should cease at once, and even though there were no cases of it now, I should be in favor of this appropriation, although the necessity for immediate action would not be so great, because it is worth that amount if the cause of the disease can be discovered and a remedy provided, whether we have the "flu" at the particular time or not. We never will be able to find a remedy unless the work is carried on and the disease is studied and investigated.

Mr. SMOOT. Do not be deceived into thinking that this money is going to be spent simply for investigation into the cause of the disease and to ascertain a remedy for it. The appropriation will be used just as a similar appropriation was used heretofore, for employing doctors all over the United States, taking them away from their regular practice, and having them visit the different cities to which the Public Health Service may send them. Nine-tenths of all of it will be expended for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, that may not be the right way to proceed, but I confess I do not know as to that. I am going to be compelled to take the judgment of those who have authority in the Public Health Service. They know more about it than I do, I confess, and I think they even know more about it than the Senator from Utah or the Senator from California. We have got to trust somebody to do the work. If they decide that the way to proceed is to spend the money to send doctors from one city to another and to stop the ravages of the disease in that way, I am going to abide by their decision, because I do not know of any better way. It may be that that is the right way, and, if they think it is the right way, that is the way they ought to proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides two things, first, to discover the cause of the disease and then to prevent its spread. Those are the objects of the bill. They were also the objects of the original appropriation made by Congress, but I know that physicians were taken from different parts of the country and sent to Alaska and never spent one minute trying to discover the cause of the "flu." They did go to Alaska and other places, however, to assist the local people in trying to prevent its spread. I repeat that nine-tenths of this sum will be spent to prevent the spread of the "flu," and the \$250,000 which I suggest as an appropriation will be all that can be spent before the regular appropriation bill comes along. In the meantime, if the "flu" subsides in the United States, then we will save the amount of money by which the appropriation is reduced, because I know as well as I know that I stand upon the floor of the Senate that if this appropriation were \$5,000,000 and the "flu" should subside in the United States in 30 days and not a case should exist anywhere in all the country, every cent of the \$5,000,000 would be spent before June 30, 1920. So I am trying to save some money to the Treasury of the United States and at the same time provide a sufficient appropriation until the regular appropriation bill comes to do just what the Senator from Maryland wants done.

Mr. PHELAN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator observes that the joint resolution was proposed last June and that its main purpose was to enable research work to be carried out in order to determine the cause of influenza. That was a very wise purpose; but now that the epidemic is here, does the Senator think that any of this money should be spent for research work? Should it not be spent to stay the epidemic by other means?

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am personally concerned, I would rather have the money spent for research work, and such work can be carried on with a very small appropriation. It does not require a great expenditure of money to enable the scientist to go into his study and investigate this disease, try to ascertain what the germ is and how to destroy it, as has been done in the case of other diseases in the past. I do not think anybody would object to an appropriation for that purpose; but I say this money is not primarily for that purpose. It will be spent, no matter what amount we appropriate, largely for preventing the spread of the disease. That is why I am in favor of appropriating \$250,000, which I think is all that this special measure ought to carry. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that he and no other Senator need be afraid, even though the "flu" is only slightly prevalent in the United States at that time, that when the regular appropriation bill comes along there will be an appropriation in that bill for this purpose; there is not a question

of doubt that there will be. All I am trying to do is to lay safe and guard the Treasury of the United States and at the same time allow this work to proceed, and I know that it can proceed until the regular appropriation bill is passed by Congress with the \$250,000 that I propose.

Mr. President, if my colleague has withdrawn his amendment, I first will offer an amendment striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting "\$250,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not prevail, and that the Senate will make at least \$500,000 immediately available for this purpose—a sum which, I think, is very small, considering the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this is a very important matter, and I do not think we ought to appropriate less than a million dollars for this purpose.

In order to get the judgment of the other Senators upon the matter, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I think it is very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gerry	McNary	Smith, Md.
Borah	Gronna	New	Smith, S. C.
Brandagee	Hale	Norris	Smoot
Calder	Harding	Nugent	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Overman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Harrison	Phelan	Townsend
Colt	Hitchcock	Phipps	Trammell
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	Kenyon	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	King	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The names of the absentees will be called.

The reading clerk called the names of the absentees, and Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. STERLING answered to their names when called.

Mr. MOSES, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. CULBERSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for a division on the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. KING] is out of the Chamber, and I understand there was an agreement—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have agreed to pair with the Senator's colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of a pair; it is a question of the amount. In behalf of my colleague, I move to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$500,000," to which the Senator from Maryland has agreed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "\$1,000,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Maryland does not bind the other members of the committee. The appropriation asked for was \$5,000,000, and as introduced the joint resolution called for an appropriation of \$1,000,000, and that was the least possible amount that could be used for this purpose.

Influenza caused more deaths in 1918 in two months in the United States than all our soldiers who were killed and died in the war against Germany. It was the worst scourge we have had in this country in many years, and it is the duty of Congress to appropriate the necessary money to prevent its recurrence.

Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah has stated that this appropriation is solely for the purpose of making laboratory investigations or investigations of that nature. I find that the joint resolution carries a great deal more than that. It provides, in the first place, for the pay of medical officers and military forces under the Public Health Service; it provides for hospital expenses; it provides for the purchase of medicine; and it goes even further than that, and says "any other expenses."

If the joint resolution went no further than the Senator from Utah has stated, I would thoroughly agree with his amendment; but a careful reading of the joint resolution will convince Senators that it does not stop there. If it did not go any further than he stated, I would be inclined to vote against the whole joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to the junior Senator or the senior Senator from Utah?

Mr. PITTMAN. I was referring to the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I think the Senator has certainly misstated my position, if I understood what he said.

Mr. PITTMAN. If I did, I am sorry.

Mr. SMOOT. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could hardly hear the Senator's statement. Did he say that I had stated that this appropriation was for the discovery of the causes of the "flu"?

Mr. PITTMAN. I stated that I understood the Senator to say that the reason why a large appropriation was not required was that the bill provided principally for some laboratory work, or work of that nature.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, the Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am very glad, then, to be corrected.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had been in the Chamber, he would have heard me make the statement that nine-tenths of the money that was to be appropriated would be spent for preventing the spread of the disease. I stated that if the appropriation was only for laboratory work, then they would not want the \$250,000, for nine-tenths, or more, in my opinion, of the appropriation that was made a year ago was used for the preventing of the spread of the disease, and very little of the appropriation that was made last year was used for laboratory work. I think the Senator will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is no difference of opinion, then. I misunderstood the Senator, and the only reason why I rose was because of that misunderstanding. But I feel the seriousness of the necessity of fighting this disease, and I would feel that it would be absurd to appropriate \$250,000 in a great campaign against a disease of this character. As far as I am concerned, it is either a useless appropriation or we should appropriate enough to combat the disease.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the trouble we find ourselves in in the Senate is that when a bill is under discussion there are but few Senators in the Chamber to listen to what is said for or against the bill. A quorum is suggested, and we can get 48 Senators, just a quorum, into the Chamber. Then the question of what we are going to vote upon comes up, and some Senator will get up and accuse another Senator of taking a certain position when it is contrary to all that he said and to his position.

To the few Senators in the Chamber now I want to say again—and I repeat it—that the regular appropriation bill which carries items of this character will be in the House of Representatives for consideration within the next two or three weeks. There is not any question but what if the "flu" is prevalent throughout the country at that time there will be more than \$500,000 asked, and there will be more than \$500,000 appropriated for the purpose of investigating it. This is an emergency measure, and I say that \$250,000 appropriated at this time can not be expended between the day when it passes Congress and the day when the appropriation made in the regular appropriation bill will be available.

I said that if this joint resolution carried \$5,000,000 and the "flu" should subside in the United States 30 days from now, and not a case appear from one end of the country to the other, every dollar of the \$5,000,000 would be spent before the end of the fiscal year. All I am asking is an appropriation to do the very work that this joint resolution provides for, giving them all that they can possibly spend before the regular appropriation comes to the Senate, and then at that time, if the "flu" is prevalent in the United States, give them all that we feel is absolutely necessary toward not only the discovery of the causes of the "flu," but to prevent the spreading of the same. Nobody is fighting the appropriation if it is necessary, but this joint resolution is an emergency matter, and whenever we appropriate more than \$250,000—I want to say that it will make no difference in the end as to the appropriation that will be made if the "flu" continues. But if the "flu" does not continue, then the Treasury of the United States will just save the difference between the \$250,000 and the amount asked for originally, because I know just as well as I live, and every Senator here knows, that no matter what the appropriation made is, if the Public Health Service, or any other department of this Government, has an appropriation, it will spend every dollar of it.

That was my position, and that was why I made the motion to reduce the amount to \$250,000, not that I thought that was all that would be necessary if the "flu" continues its ravages



throughout the country. I know that \$500,000 will not be sufficient in such a case.

I am perfectly willing that the Senate shall vote on the appropriation of \$500,000 in place of \$1,000,000 at this time, and that was the understanding that was had between the junior Senator from Utah and the Senator having the bill in charge. I shall say no more until that vote is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator having the joint resolution in charge whether it is his purpose to ask for more than \$500,000? When it came up for consideration I stated that I would object to its consideration. The Senator from Maryland approached me, and, as I understood him, stated that if the objection were withdrawn the amount would be reduced, as far as he was concerned, speaking for the committee, as I understood, to \$500,000; and with that understanding—that is, that the demand by the committee would be reduced to \$500,000—I withdrew my objection to immediate consideration, stating, however, that I was opposed to the joint resolution in any form. I felt that there was no necessity for the appropriation; that it would be utilized almost wholly to create new positions for hungry office seekers and that nothing of scientific value would result to the country. Moreover, I saw in the measure an opportunity for further Federal interference in the affairs of the States.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, in view of the exigency of the situation and in view of what I consider to be the necessity for an immediate appropriation, I did agree that, as far as I myself was concerned—not, however, attempting to bind the committee—I would be willing to accept an amendment reducing the appropriation to \$500,000; and I hope that the Senate will adopt that amendment and pass the joint resolution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is going to be any question about it, I shall take some time to give my views in extenso upon this bill and kindred measures proposed by executive agencies of the Government, and it will take longer than 2 o'clock for me to conclude.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator is unduly alarmed about it. I think that all the Senators who voted against the \$250,000, while most of us believe it ought to be a million, are willing to carry out the agreement and are willing to vote for \$500,000.

Mr. KING. With that understanding, I shall pretermitt any observations which I was ready to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "expended," on page 2, line 19, the committee report to insert a colon and the following:

*Provided, however, That any allotment of funds to universities, colleges, or other suitable research institutions as hereinafter provided, shall not be limited to any one school of medicine.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### FORT BERTHOLD INDIANS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, last week a bill was reported by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] from the Committee on Indian Affairs, which had reference only to an Indian reservation in my State. It is agreed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], who at that time thought it affected some of the Indians in his State, that the bill may be taken up. I have a letter from the department which will show that it does not affect the Indians in Nebraska, and I have submitted that letter to the Senator from Nebraska. It will lead to no discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4382), to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States, be taken up.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the Senator quite sure that it will lead to no discussion?

Mr. GRONNA. I am quite sure of it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is Calendar Monday, and we have not yet reached the calendar.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand; but there are only a few minutes left of the morning hour. All the time has been taken up on the Senate joint resolution 76.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the letter of the department read.

Mr. GRONNA. I send to the desk the letter from the Secretary of the Interior and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, January 26, 1920.

DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your informal inquiry of January 20, 1920, with respect to H. R. 4382, now receiving consideration in the Senate, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

The preamble of the bill clearly limits the tribes of Indians who are to take their claims against the Government to the Court of Claims, and names them as the Arickarees, the Gros Ventres, and the Mandans. The enacting clause embraces "all of the tribes of Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak."; and section 2 of the bill specifically provides that the said tribes or band or bands thereof are to submit their claims; and that, *inter alia*, "any band or bands of said tribes the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order."

This proposed legislation, if enacted, would be inclusive and exclusive, and would not embrace the claims of any Indians of Nebraska, nor would it permit the court to join any other Indians in the suit.

Should any of the tribes of Indians in Nebraska have claims against the Government which have not been nor are being adjudicated, they, in my opinion, should be given ample opportunity to submit such claims to the Court of Claims for final determination, as in the case of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.

Sincerely, yours,

E. B. MERITT,  
Assistant Commissioner.

HON. ASLE J. GRONNA,  
United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the committee amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 23, strike out the word "units" and insert the word "suits," so as to make the bill read:

Whereas the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in the State of North Dakota, including the tribes known as the Arickarees, the Gros Ventres, and the Mandans, and the individual members of such tribes make claim against the United States on account of various treaty provisions which, it is alleged, have not been complied with, and on account of various encroachments upon the appropriation by said Government of territory of said tribes of Indians: Therefore

*Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which any or all of the tribes of Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., may have against the United States, which have not heretofore been determined by the Court of Claims, may be submitted to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, for determination of the amount, if any, due said tribes from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation of any of the funds of said tribes, or for the failure of the United States to pay said tribe any money or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said tribe against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.*

SEC. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said courts, they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all the parties thereto, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said tribe or any band thereof. The claim or claims of the said tribes or band or bands thereof may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment, suit to be filed within five years after the passage of this act; and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff of plaintiffs and the United States party defendant, and any band or bands of said tribe the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be verified by a petitioner or an attorney employed by said petitioner, tribes of any bands thereof, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based, and said petition

shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said tribe or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribes or bands of Indians.

Sec. 3. That upon the final determination of such suit, cause, or action the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribe or bands of Indians, under contracts negotiated and approved as provided by existing law, and in no case shall the fee decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amounts stipulated in the contracts approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and no attorney shall have a right to represent the said tribe or any band thereof in any suit, cause, or action under the provisions of this act until his contract shall have been approved as herein provided. The fees decreed by the court to the attorney or attorneys of record shall be paid out of any sum or sums recovered in such suits or actions, and no part of such fee shall be taken from any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to such tribes or bands of Indians in whose behalf the suit is brought unless specifically authorized in the contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### AMERICANIZATION OF ALIENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3315.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3315) to promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English-speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] striking out the words "for stationery, printing, illustrative material, \$75,000."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not think it would be fair to proceed in the absence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. He does not seem to be in the Chamber. Therefore I will have to call for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The roll will be called.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Gronna	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Hale	New	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Harrison	Nugent	Trammell
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Watson
Dial	Kenyon	Sherman	Wolcott
Fernald	Lenroot	Smith, S. C.	
France	McKellar	Smoot	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. PHELAN, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland answered to their names when called.

Mr. BORAH, Mr. MOSES, and Mr. PITTMAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. MOSES. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. KEYES] on account of illness in his family. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have sent for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I called for a quorum in order to have him present, and I dislike to take up the matter without him. I am going to take my five minutes, or a portion of it, in the hope that he may get here within that time.

The amendment of the Senator from Missouri seeks to strike out of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah the words "for printing, stationery, illustrative matter, \$75,000." The Senator from Missouri made the point in his speech on

Saturday that the Government should do nothing along the line of printing.

The proponents of the measure have raised no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Utah. It cuts the appropriation about \$170,000. It cuts the officers for administration that the Department of the Interior thinks necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill, but we have recognized the necessity of economy, and I believe that we have gone as far as we ought to go in cutting on the administrative features of the bill. I do not myself believe that the country is going to applaud any effort to cut down the sums that may be needed in this Americanization proposition.

After we have done this and conceded cuts from \$500,000 to \$336,100 the proposition is made to cut it still another \$75,000 by striking out the provision I have stated. The money is necessary to print charts and primers and devices for teaching, easy methods of teaching language to be sent to the teachers of the country, simple statements on the Constitution, simple stories of the lives of Americans who are dead—none of it to be used in anywise to boom any living Americans, as I understand it—descriptive pamphlets about the country, the issuance of a little paper, such as has been called the Americanization paper, being a means of communication between the different parts of the country. If something good has been done in this line in the East this carries it to the West, and if in the West this carries it to the Middle West and the Middle West carries it back to the East, and so forth. This is the general purpose of the article.

The Senator from Missouri intimates that it will be used to spread propaganda. We have got to have some faith in this Government in our public officials. I think one of the greatest troubles in the country to-day is the lack of confidence in the American Congress by the people of the United States. They seem willing to believe evil of their public men rather than good. They seem to think we are not doing our duty here no matter how hard we may work. If we are not willing to trust other branches of the Government, and if we insist that through the executive administration of the Government wrongs are to be purposely done by men in power in the executive branches of the Government, how can we hope to escape condemnation from the people as to our motives? To me it is a very bad thing and very unfortunate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the Senator if a document similar to the one I have in my hand would be prevented from being printed by the bureau here in case the amendment of the Senator from Missouri prevails? This document is entitled "Americanization Letter No. 2," gotten out by John J. Mahoney, State supervisor of Americanization, division of university extension, Massachusetts department of education. It is addressed to the superintendents of schools and directors of immigrant education, and consists of 15 points for workers in Americanization, being a "suggestive platform of principles, convictions, and points of view," a very instructive document.

Mr. KENYON. I have seen that document.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Would such a document be prevented from being printed and issued by the Bureau of Education?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; it could not be printed. There could not be any printing done, and further, let me say, these printing houses will not print unless there be a demand, and these new documents may have to be printed in different languages and have to be printed by the Government, because printing houses will not do it until there is a large demand.

My five minutes have expired, and I am sorry the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is not yet here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I was under the impression that the amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah was agreed to, and then to accommodate the Senator from Missouri we reconsidered it. There is no objection to it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that in the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah provision is made for the pay of one at \$5,000 and four at \$4,000 each, in lines 2 and 3 on page 3 of the reprint of the bill. I notice that in the law creating



the Bureau of Education and the offices under it, there is one commissioner at \$5,000, and the highest paid official next to the commissioner receives \$3,500. I recall that at past sessions of Congress there has been an effort made to increase the pay of those \$3,500 men to \$4,000.

They have been unable to procure that increase. In this amendment the work of the Commissioner of Education, as I understand, is duplicated. He is already getting \$5,000 a year, and there is created by the amendment another place at \$5,000, and four places are created carrying a salary of \$4,000 each. Does not the Senator think we might reduce those appropriations somewhat?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I called upon the Interior Department when the Senator from Utah made his suggestion as to lump-sum appropriations to furnish the list of the necessary officers to do this work and the amount of their salaries. The department furnished that list. I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi has seen it or not. I then sat down with the Senator from Utah and we sliced that list almost to pieces. We cut down the number of officers that they wanted. This is much less than they asked for.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it the intention that the Commissioner of Education shall hold this \$5,000 office?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. HARRISON. It is a separate and distinct office?

Mr. KENYON. Yes. The department will have to secure experts; they will have to have men who could command much higher salaries than those provided in the bill. One man of whom I know who probably can be secured for the work, and who has been doing the work for practically nothing, has now taken a position at \$10,000 a year. He might come back to that office; we should like to have him; but you can not secure men for this kind of work at such salaries unless they are stimulated by patriotic motives.

Mr. HARRISON. I merely wished to call attention to that matter.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that we cut out about 15 of the positions the department asked for.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KENYON. I yield the floor; but will not the Senator let us vote on the proposed substitute?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to have the Secretary state the question which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending question.

The READING CLERK. Mr. Smoot proposes to strike out section 3, as printed in the bill, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. That of the amount appropriated by section 2 above, \$336,100 may be deducted and used for the following purposes:

Administrative officers, specialists, and field officers in Washington, D. C.: One at \$5,000, four at \$4,000 each, three at \$3,500 each, five at \$3,000 each, four at \$2,750 each, five at \$2,500 each; total, \$70,000.

Clerks, stenographers, and messengers in Washington, D. C.: One at \$2,000, 3 at \$1,800 each, 6 at \$1,600 each, 10 at \$1,400 each; 5 at \$1,200 each; total, \$37,000.

Regional officers: Four at \$3,500 each, eight at \$3,000 each; total, \$38,000.

Clerks and stenographers in regional offices: Four at \$1,400 each, four at \$1,200 each; total, \$10,400.

For printing, stationery, illustrative material, \$75,000.

For traveling and subsistence, \$30,000.

Rent of regional offices, \$5,000.

Part-time expert help in preparing material for teaching, \$50,000.

Ten short-course training schools for supervisors and directors and those who will train teachers, \$20,000.

Incidentals and contingencies, \$7,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa what is the necessity for making appropriations for regional directors or regional organizations? I am not sure that I caught the language accurately.

Mr. KENYON. The thought is that the country will be divided for this work into different regions; somewhat similar to the plan of the regional Federal banks.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that that is unwise? With this organization which functions here in Washington, with the personnel which it will have, with the purpose to have a nation-wide plan in dealing with this matter, and in view of the fact that appropriations are to be made directly to the State where they themselves make corresponding appropriations, is there any necessity for any intermediary organization?

Mr. KENYON. I do not feel that way about it. This is a part of the national organization; it can not all be done here. I will state to the Senator that what I object to is cutting it down as it has been cut. I think that is a great mistake; I

think the full amount of \$300,000 was none too much to be used for all of the work of section 3; but I was persuaded to consent to that by the Senator's colleague.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I should like to see it cut still more. I think we are building up too much machinery for every appropriation which we make. There seems to be too much of a desire to look after the machinery and rather too little desire to look after the things to be accomplished by the machinery. The result is we too often have more sound and more noise than we have results. It is machinery and still more machinery; Federal organizations and still more Federal organizations; bureaus and still more bureaus; divisions and still more divisions; functionaries and still more functionaries; until the land is filled with representatives of the Government of the United States. It is not any longer a Government of the States, a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people; it is a Government of officeholders, for officeholders, and for the benefit of officeholders. When they can not get enough out of the municipalities and out of the States then they come to Congress and get it out of the Treasury of the United States. There is a vast amount of solicitude manifested by Senators and by Representatives for officials and for officialdom, for functionaries, and for a paternalistic, autocratic bureaucracy.

I am getting tired and disgusted with the whole system of Federal interposition in the affairs of the States which leads to the creation of an army of Federal employees which will fill Washington and take possession of the States and eat out the substance of the people. If we must appropriate for the States to aid them in performing the functions placed upon them, it would be far better to do so directly than to have the funds filter through the hands of a multitude of Federal officials. I do not know where the end is going to be, Mr. President.

A moment ago I called attention to something which I thought at first must be a mistake, but when I read it in a reputable paper, such as the Christian Science Monitor, and when my colleague stated that the matter had come to his attention as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was convinced, of course, of the verity of the report. The effect of the report is that the Public Health Service of the Government is going into the States and going to make a survey of every home, examine every child, classify the children of the people, find out their infantile diseases and their ailments, and, of course, their physiological idiosyncracies. Then will come an examination of their mental status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. KING. Are we operating now under the five-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The five-minute rule applies to the discussion of amendments.

Mr. KING. I can only appeal to the good sense of the American people to repudiate the wild, fantastic, and un-American policies which we are adopting and which in the end will culminate in the overthrow of this Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to insert as an independent section the following:

In the administration of this act the laws of the several States providing for the separation of the races in the schools therein shall be conformed to and observed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer that amendment on behalf of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], who is ill at his home. The amendment as read is a modification of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee on January 22, and in its modified form, as I understand, it is entirely satisfactory to the chairman of the committee. So I merely ask for a vote.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator showed me that amendment, and I see no objection to it, but I should like to have it again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. KENYON. That amendment applies only to the separation of the races in the schools.

Mr. LENROOT. Suppose that the law providing for race separation also provided that a certain percentage of the appropriation so made should be allotted to one race and a larger percentage to the other race?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KENYON. That is in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LENROOT. The amendment provides that the laws of the several States shall be conformed to.

Mr. KENYON. As to the separation of races. There may be some objection of the kind referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin, but I think the whole bill is broad enough to let the Secretary of the Interior govern that question, because the bill provides that if the fund is not used justly he may refuse to permit the apportionment to be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin and to other Senators that my understanding of the amendment is that it is not intended in the slightest degree to cut out anybody in any State from the benefits of the bill. The only purpose of the amendment is to provide for observing the laws separating the races in some of the States, like California and a number of the Southern States.

Mr. KENYON. Personally, it seems to me it is not necessary now, because we are not going into the States under this proposed law and try in any way to interfere with education within the States. It is purely a stimulating proposition. I think that error has crept into this debate and has aroused a good deal of opposition to the bill that should not have been here. I can see no substantial difficulty in the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I rise to ask a question, and the Senator can answer it in my time. I have not been able to understand why the amendment was offered, for it seems to me that it is entirely unnecessary; and I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think, even without the amendment, that the laws of those States providing for separate schools would be conformed to without interfering in any way with the carrying out of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can not say about that. They have the separation in a number of the States—the Southern States, and California, probably, and one or two other Western States—and my colleague, Mr. SHIELDS, after an examination of the law, thought it would be wisest and safest to put this kind of a statement in the bill. I can see no objection to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the Senator in offering the amendment, and his colleague in proposing it, have no such thing in mind as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin, I suppose?

Mr. McKELLAR. None whatever. I have none, and I am sure my colleague had no such thing in mind. We merely wish to conform to the State laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. At the end of section 2 it is proposed to insert the following:

*Provided, That such charge as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior be exacted of each person attending any school maintained in whole or in part from any funds provided for under the provisions of this act as will reimburse the Treasury of the United States.*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this bill as it was originally drafted would have cost the taxpayers of the country \$85,000,000. It has been gradually brought down until upon its face it will take out of the Federal Treasury \$6,500,000; but the law will be upon the statute books, and each year it will be up to Congress to say how much will be appropriated. There is no limit as to how much can be appropriated when the law is once upon the books.

In 1918 we passed legislation giving to the Bureau of Naturalization the right to educate people applying for naturalization in this country. They put on a great scheme of education. There are now practically 3,000 communities in the United States where aliens are being educated so that they can become naturalized, and all that work has cost the Government of the United States nothing, although they have performed a great service in educating the foreign population. Instead of costing the United States anything, that bureau has turned into the Treasury over \$500,000. They charged a fee for naturalizing these people, and a part of the fee went toward the purchase of copies of a book called the Student's Textbook, that dealt with the subjects that are provided for in the Sterling amendment, adopted on last Saturday.

Here is what the report of the Commissioner of Naturalization says touching this matter:

#### FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT UNNECESSARY.

It is only by supporting this work that has been so successfully inaugurated and carried on, at no national expense but through the expenditure of millions of dollars annually by the various communities throughout the Nation, that their desires may be made possible. The Federal cost of administration is borne by the seekers after citizenship; all other costs are maintained by the communities in which the schools are organized. This seems to be the proper distribution of this financial burden; those who are to derive the benefits should bear the expense.

This can not be contradicted. This bill provides for the education of aliens in this country up to 50 years of age. Some of those men are making as high as \$10 and \$15 a day, perhaps. Why should the Federal Government, if the bill should pass, bear the expense of teaching those people how to read, write, and understand the English language? This work is now being carried on through the Department of Labor, and to pass this bill will be but a duplication of that work.

Whatever cost is involved in the present plan is paid by the beneficiaries who are seeking naturalization; and so, if the amendment I have proposed is adopted, it should not cost the taxpayers of this country this enormous amount. The cost ought to be paid by the men who are going to get the benefits of it. They are able to pay it, and why should they not?

I heard the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] say in his speech that up in the works of the United States Steel Corporation there were thousands of these foreigners who had been brought over, I believe, by the United States Steel Corporation. Ought the Treasury of the United States bear the expense of teaching those people how to read and write? They are making money; they are abundantly able to bear it; and so, if this amendment is adopted, this charge must be paid by them. It will be figured out by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Treasury of the United States will be reimbursed to that amount.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I have a clipping from the New York Times of this morning, dealing with this subject, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the article will be read.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York Times of Monday, Jan. 26, 1919.]

#### TO EXTEND SCHOOLS FOR ALIENS.

Americanization work of the League of Foreign Born Citizens is to be greatly enlarged soon by the establishment of additional branch schools in The Bronx, Harlem, Brooklyn, and Richmond Hill, Long Island, according to announcement yesterday by its president, Nathaniel Phillips. The league now operates two branches, at 407 East Seventy-third Street and 95 Second Avenue, where foreigners are taught cardinal American principles and prepare for naturalization. To discuss present-day problems of naturalization and plans for widening the scope of the work of the league, Mrs. Vincent Astor, member of the executive committee, has issued invitations for a meeting to be held in her home, 840 Fifth Avenue, February 5.

Mr. CALDER. I simply want to add to the statement just read that this work is being done without any cost to the Federal Government. Part of the expense is paid by those seeking education in the English language and the rest by private subscription. I commend the article to the Senators interested in this subject.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word with regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

It seems to me that by the charge provided for in his amendment we would defeat the very purposes of the bill. Of course our general system of common-school education is a free common-school system, where the student attends without the payment of any charge or any tuition fee whatsoever. If there is reason generally for a free public-school system, I think there is added reason why, considering the class of people that we are seeking to educate by this bill, it should be a free school system; I mean free from the standpoint of any charge or any tuition fee. It seems to me quite inconsistent that we should have a compulsory school system and charge the pupil for attending that school, which the law compels him to attend. From the very nature of things, it seems to me it must necessarily be free. We can not compel a man to go to school and then pay a tuition fee for his attendance.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Does it not seem to the Senator from South Dakota rather inconsistent that certain States in this Union do not provide for compulsory education, and yet in this bill you do provide, for those States, compulsory education between the ages of 16 and 21? Is not that a rather inconsistent position?

Mr. STERLING. No; it is not an inconsistent position, Mr. President. This is for the special purpose of Americanizing



persons who are to be citizens of the United States. Of course, the education provided for will pertain for the most part—and that is the main object of the bill, I suppose—to the alien element in our population who are either illiterate or who can not read, write, or speak the English language. For the most part it will pertain to those persons. It is not a State matter alone. It is a governmental, a national, matter, quite as much, if not more, than it is a State matter.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I believe.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the committee ever have before it the head of this educational training bureau of the naturalization department of the Department of Labor?

Mr. STERLING. I am not sure; not at any time when I was present at a meeting of the committee, and I think not at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the committee give any consideration to the great work that that branch of the Government is doing?

Mr. STERLING. I am not sure as to that. The chairman of the committee can answer better than I can in that regard. I think there were two or three meetings of the committee at which I was not present. Whether or not there was any hearing of that kind I am not quite sure, but my belief is that there was not.

Mr. HARRISON. In forming his conclusions, did the Senator give any consideration to the work that that department was doing?

Mr. STERLING. Not particularly; no.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator was not aware, then, that they had established these schools in 3,000 communities in the United States to educate these foreigners?

Mr. STERLING. Oh, well, I think that is aside from the question.

Mr. HARRISON. Why is it aside from the question? It is doing exactly the work that the Senator proposes in this bill to do.

Mr. STERLING. It is aside from the question involved in the Senator's proposed amendment, which is to impose a charge on all those who attend the school or who avail themselves of the school facilities provided in this bill. It would not do, I think, if I may say so.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator thinks that in the case of one who is 45 or 50 years of age, a foreigner in this country, who is making good wages, five or ten dollars a day, it would be an undue burden upon him to pay the tuition required to go to school in order to help himself?

Mr. STERLING. No; I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that I do not think it would be an undue burden upon the foreigner who is earning his \$8 to \$10 a day; but there are thousands upon thousands of them who are not earning that. There are more who are not earning over \$4.65 a day than there are who are earning more than that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], of course, destroys the purpose of the bill, and its adoption would be equivalent to defeating the bill. I do not know whether that is the intention of it or not.

I have noticed in the debate that those who are opposed to the whole proposition continually refer to the work being done by the Department of Labor as being exactly the same work, and this being a duplicate of that. Some of these gentlemen, I think, opposed that provision for the Department of Labor—a \$200,000 appropriation for the Department of Labor for 2,000 schools, it is claimed. That would be \$100 a school. What kind of a school are you going to have with a \$100 appropriation for the payment of the teachers for a number of months? Of course, there is a general impression that you can employ teachers for about nothing. That work is confined solely to preparing men for naturalization. It has been attempted to take over this entire matter by the Department of Labor, but it is now being used solely as an argument, by those who are opposed to this bill, to destroy the bill. It is not a duplication of work. It is carried on there in a small way. There is no great, broad purpose as in the case of this bill, and it ought to be entirely in the hands of one department, and that ought to be the Bureau of Education.

It seems to me the mistake the Senator from Mississippi makes, in compelling these men to pay for their education and to pay for attending school in a land where we pride ourselves upon free schools, is that this work is not entirely for the benefit of the men who are learning the English language, or are being educated. This bill is on the theory that ignorance and illiteracy is a danger to this country, a danger to us, a danger to our institu-

tions, the greatest danger that we have, a greater danger than any danger from the outside; and the purpose of this bill is to protect ourselves and our country, not to educate these men merely for their own gratification or their own advancement. That is the error, it seems to me, in the argument as made by the Senator from Mississippi.

It seems to me that if this is adopted we may as well abandon the whole proposition. It is contrary to the genius of our institutions; it is contrary to our great system of free schools; and while there are plenty of foreigners who can pay for this education, they can just as well pay for the education of their children, and we do not require that of them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harding	Lenroot	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Harris	McKellar	Smoot
Chamberlain	Harrison	Nelson	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Trammell
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Wadsworth
Dial	Kenyon	Philips	Walsh, Mass.
France	King	Pittman	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Sheppard	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. SIMMONS answered to their names when called.

Mr. McNARY, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. PHELAN, and Mr. POMERENE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCER, Mr. WALSH of Montana, Mr. CALDER, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. LODGE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I wanted to use a little time on this amendment for the purpose of explaining another feature of the bill. I may say, incidentally, regarding this particular amendment, that it seems to me if it were adopted it would practically nullify the purposes of the whole bill. Therefore I shall oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

However, I desire, Mr. President, to call attention to some other provisions of the bill. I am a member of the committee which reported the bill. Previous to its being reported I called attention to certain conditions which might make it necessary to amend the bill, and it was understood at the time that some amendment would be necessary in regard to the matters which were then discussed.

I am very much in favor of the bill, but, in my judgment, unless the bill is amended there will not be one dollar of the money used under the bill in any State in the Union, if the provisions of the bill are enforced. In other words, in my judgment the bill will prove to be inoperative, and it is for the purpose of putting life into it and making it operative that I am going to suggest an amendment which I will offer when the bill comes into the Senate. The bill requires under section 7 that—

The Secretary of the Interior shall (a) withhold the unpaid portion of an allotment to any State whenever he determines that any portion of the sums allotted are not being properly applied for the purposes of this act, or may (b) deduct—

And so on. Under section 9 it is provided that—

The Secretary of the Interior shall annually ascertain whether the several States are using or are prepared to use the money allotted to or received by them under this act, and shall certify, on or before the 10th day of August of each year, to the Secretary of the Treasury (a) each State which has accepted the provisions of this act and complied therewith—

And so on.

Mr. President, let us turn to page 5, subdivision (e). Under that provision before any State can receive any money at all it shall "require all resident persons, whether citizens of the United States or aliens, 16 years of age or over and under 21

years of age, who are not physically or mentally disqualified and who are illiterate," and so on, to attend school for a definite period of time. That makes that provision as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians. There are two exceptions—where a person is suffering from a physical or mental disability. No others are provided for. I will venture to assert that there will not be a State in the Union which will require all its citizens who are not physically or mentally disqualified to attend and receive that amount of instruction.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, they must be illiterate or unable to speak, read, or write the English language.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand that, but I mean all those illiterates who are unable to read and speak, except those who are physically and mentally disqualified. The Senator knows that in many of the States of the Union there are laws to compel the attendance of all children of certain ages, and the Senator knows that those laws do not result in securing the actual attendance of all who come within their provisions. It is easy to imagine many circumstances which might temporarily or during the whole year prevent people who are illiterate and who are not physically or mentally disqualified from receiving instruction in the schools, and we can not frame a law in a State which would bring about that result. Moreover, we do not want to attempt anything here which is either impossible or impracticable, and therefore, when the bill comes into the Senate, I shall propose to amend by inserting after the word "require" the words "as far as possible and practicable." That would still leave it within the control of the Secretary of the Interior to say whether proper provisions had been made or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator talking on the amendment or on the bill?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am talking on the amendment at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator's time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and vote "nay."

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

Mr. RANSDELL. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call resulted—yeas 4, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—4.			
Dial	Harris	Harrison	King
NAYS—37.			
Ball	Hale	New	Sterling
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Phelan	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
France	Kirby	Pomerene	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gerry	Lodge	Sherman	
Gore	McKellar	Smoot	
Gronna	McNary	Spencer	
NOT VOTING—54.			
Ashurst	Dillingham	Henderson	McCormick
Bankhead	Edge	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber
Beckham	Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	McLean
Borah	Fall	Jones, Wash.	Moses
Brandeggee	Fernald	Kendrick	Myers
Caldor	Fletcher	Keyes	Nelson
Colt	Gay	Knox	Newberry
Culberson	Harding	La Follette	Overman

Owen	Reed	Smith, Md.	Wadsworth
Page	Robinson	Smith, S. C.	Walsh, Mont.
Penrose	Shields	Stanley	Warren
Pittman	Simmons	Swanson	Williams
Poindexter	Smith, Ariz.	Thomas	
Ransdell	Smith, Ga.	Underwood	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the call of the roll 4 Senators have voted "yea" and 37 have voted "nay," and there are 3 Senators present and not voting, disclosing that there is no quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll for a quorum.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Calder	Harris	Lenroot	Poindexter
Capper	Harrison	McCormick	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smith, S. C.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Smoot
Dial	Kellogg	Nugent	Sterling
Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	Overman	Sutherland
Gronna	King	Phelan	Trammell
Hale	Kirby	Phipps	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. McKellar, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Wadsworth, Mr. Walsh of Massachusetts, and Mr. Watson answered to their names when called.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to state that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness of his wife.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BALL, Mr. COLT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HARDING, Mr. GERRY, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. MOSES entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], upon which the yeas and nays were once called and disclosed the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will again call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of the illness of his wife. I am paired with him during that absence. I find I can transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I do so, and vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement in reference to my pair as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARDING. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BALL. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I understand that my pair, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], who is absent, I believe, on account of illness. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];



The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 46, as follows:

## YEAS—4.

Dial	Harris	Harrison	Williams
Ball	Harding	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Phelan	Trammell
Cummins	Kenyon	Phipps	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kirby	Poinexter	Walsh, Mass.
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Reed	Watson
Gerry	McCormick	Sheppard	Welcott
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	McNary	Smoot	

## NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Gay	Moses	Simmons
Bankhead	Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Henderson	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Borah	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Stanley
Culberson	Kendrick	Page	Swanson
Dillingham	Keyes	Penrose	Thomas
Edge	King	Pittman	Underwood
Elkins	Knox	Ransdell	Warren
Fall	La Follette	Robinson	
Fernald	McCumber	Sherman	
Fletcher	McLean	Shields	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there is an amendment on page 1. The language beginning in line 7, on that page, embracing the words "and with the Territories and possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands" should be stricken from the bill. I was under the impression that those words were out of the bill, but I move to strike them out now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out "and with the Territories and possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands."

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I think the words at the end of line 8, and in line 9, should also go out of the bill. Otherwise there will be a repetition.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is correct; the remainder of the section embracing the words "in the education of illiterates" should also be stricken out, and I make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will now be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 7, after the word "language," it is proposed to strike out "and with the Territories and possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands, in the education of illiterates."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] had some amendments that he wanted to propose. He has stepped out for a moment. I have an amendment which I wish to propose, to strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the promotion of the public schools in the instruction of candidates for citizenship now being carried on by the Division of Citizenship Training of the Bureau of Naturalization is hereby extended to include all persons of the age of 16 years and upward who shall attend classes of instruction conducted or maintained by any civic, educational, community, racial, or other organization, under the supervision of the public-school authorities, and the provisions of the ninth subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 596), as amended by the act of May 9, 1908 (40 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 542), are hereby made applicable to this added authority. In discharging this additional authority the director of citizenship is also authorized to disseminate information regarding the institutions of the United States Government in such manner as will best stimulate loyalty to those institutions, making use of the means heretofore provided and through use of pictures, slides, and motion pictures. The motion pictures and motion-picture negatives in the possession of the various branches of the Government shall also be available for these purposes. In this work the aid of civic, educational, community, racial, and other organizations may be secured by the director of citizenship, who shall compile statistical information as to aliens in their relation to citizenship. The foregoing shall apply to the residents of the Panama Canal Zone.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 to carry out the foregoing provisions and purposes of this act, including expenses incidental thereto, and for personal services in the District of Columbia, to be available to June 30, 1921, or until

expended. The amounts hereby appropriated shall be in addition to all other allotments for positions in the work of the Division of Citizenship Training heretofore made from appropriations for the Bureau of Naturalization.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, that amendment is designed to broaden the authority now exercised by the Citizenship Division of the Naturalization Bureau. That work has been efficiently done by these people. I have here some books that are issued by them on good citizenship, Americanism, and so forth. As stated before in my remarks, they have established in practically 3,000 communities these schools for the education of foreigners. If this amendment should be adopted, it would give them more money to operate on. It would allow them to place this literature in the hands of every person, irrespective of whether he wanted to be naturalized or not. It would give them the use of the motion pictures also.

If the Senators on the Republican side of this Chamber really want to practice some economy and really desire to Americanize somebody in this country, they have an opportunity here. I noticed in the morning's newspaper that the steering committee of the other House have lopped off a million dollars, I believe, from the appropriation for the enforcement of the prohibition law in the deficiency bill just reported by the Appropriations Committee of the other House.

Let me call the attention of the Senate, in discussing this proposition, to the fact that in the sundry civil bill at the first session since the other side came into control the department requested \$2,900,000 to enforce the immigration laws, and in the following deficiency bill they requested \$300,000, totaling \$3,200,000. They were allowed \$2,600,000, lopping off \$600,000 from the important work of enforcing the immigration laws of this country. For the deportation of aliens \$350,000 was requested, and to enforce the alien-enemy act \$600,000 was requested by the department, and the committee and the Congress disallowed the whole amount and gave them nothing in the deficiency act. In the next deficiency bill \$150,000 was requested for deportation and \$100,000 was given.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator made a statement that I think perhaps could be misconstrued. I know the Senator does not want to do that.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I do not want to give a wrong impression.

Mr. SMOOT. It is true that no appropriation was made for the deportation of aliens in the deficiency appropriation bill, and it is true that \$350,000 was requested, as I remember, for that purpose; but in an appropriation bill, before a deficiency bill was presented, there was an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that the estimate was \$3,200,000, and only \$2,600,000 was allowed. Their estimate was \$3,200,000. In other words, there was a cutting down of \$600,000 at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe we cut it quite enough.

Mr. HARRISON. Perhaps not.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say further that that estimate was cut after a most thorough investigation into the items to which the appropriation was to apply; and the Committee on Appropriations considered that there was no question, upon the statements made by the officials of the department themselves, that it was not necessary to appropriate the amount of the estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not discussing that. I am discussing the proposition that the department estimated for so much money, and this economy Congress has cut it down so much money, to deport these alien enemies from this country and to enforce the immigration laws of this country. I go further. In this last bill the Department of Justice requested \$1,000,000 to prosecute enemy aliens and they were granted only \$750,000 of it. For naturalization, during the first session of this Congress, they requested \$862,900 and were allowed only \$450,000. In the last deficiency bill they requested \$268,600 and were given nothing. So we have this situation before us—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I am speaking on the bill now, Mr. President. I believe under the rule I have 15 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Mississippi spoken on the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the time the Senator has already taken part of the 15 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was on his amendment, as the Chair understands.

Mr. HARRISON. Under the rule I can talk five minutes at a time on an amendment that is up. I have not talked on the bill the 15 minutes allowed under the rule.

Mr. KENYON. I raise the point that the 5 minutes already spoken should be taken out of the 15.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, give me 10 minutes more, then. I shall not utilize all the time.

I merely want to say that here are the departments requesting from Congress money to enforce the immigration law and to deport the alien enemies in this country and to put our hands upon part of the foreigners in this country. The Congress is doing nothing in that instance, but is trying to economize. Here they come with a bill that in its original state would have taxed the people of this country \$85,000,000 to educate some foreigners in this country who perhaps need not have been admitted. As I have stated before, I should like to see the immigration laws more stringent. I should like to see immigrants kept out of this country for a definite length of time; but the Citizenship Division in the Bureau of Naturalization are doing exactly the work that is proposed to be done by this bill. They can do the work just as efficiently on the outlay of \$300,000 that is proposed in my amendment. If the Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber really want to economize, and do not desire to deceive the American people, let them help us on this side to adopt this amendment, appropriating only \$300,000, getting the same results that it was proposed to get by the bill in its original form, which sought to appropriate \$85,000,000.

Mr. KENYON, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. DIAL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wanted to take 15 minutes on the bill, but I do not believe it would be fair for me to do so if other Senators really want to take 5 minutes on any of these amendments in good faith. If they do, I will not presume to take 15 minutes at this late hour, but I will take 5 minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I merely wanted to call attention to the amendment that has been tendered; but if the Senator wants to speak upon it, I will wait until he gets through.

Mr. KENYON. I want to make some remarks on the bill. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], I know, rose. If he wants to take five minutes, I will give way to him. I should like five minutes before the debate closes.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I shall take only one minute.

I have been wondering during the last few weeks who is going to do the work of the world. I must say that I think the Senate is the most considerate body I ever saw. Here some time ago they passed a bill, I believe, that no one under 16, or perhaps 14, years of age could work. I think that law has been set aside by the Supreme Court. Now, I believe there is some talk of pensioning everybody over 50 years old. Then we come here to-day with this bill to force everybody from 16 to 21 years who can not read or write or understand the English language to go to school, and to allow anybody else in the same condition up to 50 years of age to go to school. I had been considerably disturbed about who would do the work of the world until I saw in the paper a day or two ago that in Russia the Bolsheviks are going to make people work 12 hours a day, and therefore I think the country will be safe when everybody goes to school.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there have been some of the most remarkable arguments made on this bill that anyone has ever heard on this floor. They have shown a lack of knowledge of the purposes of this bill, and in many instances, apparently, those making the arguments have never read the bill. One of the great purposes of this bill at the commencement, given full consideration by the committee, was to start on the pathway of making this a one-language Nation.

The Vice President, in a speech in Florida a few days ago, with that good fund of common sense that he possesses, took that position, that we should become a one-language Nation.

The Senator from Mississippi, in speaking on this bill a few days ago, took the position that to become a good American you must learn to speak our language, or practically that.

That is one of the things we are trying to do. Now, we have a bill here, starting out on that plan, enlarged somewhat by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], to teach in these schools the principles of the American Government, some American history, and the principles of civil government; and I am astounded, where we have this great wave of unrest sweeping over the world and in our country, this Bolshevism, that Senators who have been the strongest on this floor against Bolshevism have been strongly against this bill. I can not understand it. It is to be regretted.

Our purpose has been to help meet the arguments of the I. W. W.'s the arguments of the reds, the arguments of the Bolsheviks, with arguments as to what the American Government is, what a land of equal opportunity and of exact justice this is. To hear some of these arguments one would think we

were trying to interfere with the colored question in the South, that we were trying to waste the money of the people on this fantastic proposition, by which the Federal Government is trying to help lend a friendly hand to the States in this great work.

We are talked to by the junior Senator from Mississippi about the lack of economy of the Republican Party. I am sorry this thing gets into politics; it has no place there. I am sorry you ever dragged this question of races in here; it has no place in here. Politics has no place here.

The Republican Party has been extravagant, as you have been extravagant, and it does not lie in the mouths of either side to talk very much about the extravagance of the other side. When you talk to Republicans about economy, I say to you that there is no economy in withholding money to stamp out the blight of ignorance and illiteracy in this country. It is the worst enemy to the Republic; and I do not believe the people of the United States are going to view with any satisfaction the cheese-paring of this Congress in this great work of Americanizing the illiterates and the foreigners in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator mind one question?

Mr. KENYON. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator think that a dollar spent in preventing the admission of illiteracy and ignorance is better than a dollar spent in trying to cure it after it has been permitted to come in?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; but if you have not spent the dollar preventing their coming in, then you would better spend a dollar curing the disease, would you not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should say you had better deport them about as soon as you could.

Mr. KENYON. Deport them; yes. Does the Senator think that he is going to solve the difficulties of this country by deporting people?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not.

Mr. KENYON. You can deport your Berkman and your Emma Goldman but you do not deport their ideas. That is the trouble.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree thoroughly with the Senator about that. I was merely talking about deporting ignorance, and there is a way of doing that, and that is to refuse to allow ignorance to vote, and after a while ignorance will go on back home.

Mr. KENYON. Why does not the Senator do it? Our committee has tried to do something, and we meet nothing but criticism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My State has done it.

Mr. KENYON. Show us something better.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My State does not allow illiterates to vote.

Mr. KENYON. No; I understand that, and so does everybody else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Massachusetts does not allow it and Connecticut does not allow it.

Mr. KENYON. Let us discuss the economy question. You gentlemen from certain States, wherever you have a flood or a fire, come in here and ask help of the Federal Government. I have voted for appropriations to put seeds down in your States, where you had floods that wiped out large areas of your territory. You did not talk then, as the Senator from Mississippi did the other day, about "the miserable Federal Government keeping its hands off our shoulders and its hands out of our pockets."

You have had appropriations for the eradication of sheep scab and cattle diseases, appropriations to teach the people how to raise hogs, for experiments in dairy industry, and in preparing horses for breeding for military purposes; experiments in poultry feeding, hog cholera, teaching farmers' wives how to make cottage cheese, fighting every kind of a bug that ever came into your States, blights on pecan orchards, and fighting the boll weevil; and has not the Federal Government always been willing to help you? Is there any worse boll weevil than that of ignorance? Is there any worse blight than that of illiteracy?

Talk about economy! There were \$150,000,000 asked for before a House committee by a Cabinet officer the other day for foreign nations, without the blink of an eye. This is for our own Nation and our own people.

A billion and a half dollars is asked for for the Army and Navy, and yet a little expense for the education of our people meets with opposition.

That is not the kind of economy the American people want. They are willing to spend every dollar that is necessary to give



every boy and girl in this country an education, and if a State will not do it, it is the duty of the Federal Government to do so.

The Senator from Mississippi can talk about it being no affair of the Federal Government. He loses track entirely of the dual relationship of our citizens. If your States are going to teach Bolshevism and I. W. Wism, do you tell me it is no concern of the Federal Government? I tell you we could put schools right into the States and teach the contrary doctrine.

Out at Gary, where we found there were tons and tons of red literature, was it directed against the States? No; it was directed against the Federal Government. The Bolsheviks and I. W. W.'s are not trying to overturn States. They are trying to change the Federal Government, and when we educate and put up our ideals against theirs it is to save the Federal Government. You can not reach it by bludgeons, and you can not reach it in any way but by education. We are still spelling this Nation with a big "N," and will continue so to do.

When you get through taking all of these appropriations for all of these materialistic things it will be time then to talk to us about stopping helping the States.

Mr. President, we are met with the argument that there is duplication. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi is, like his other amendments, to destroy this bill. We have had other Senators arguing that this work was being duplicated. Two or three hundred thousand dollars expended by the Department of Labor. What the States have done, what the Bureau of Naturalization has done, is answered by the figures on these charts, showing 8,500,000 people in this country who can not read or write the English language, and if that is the record of the Bureau of Naturalization, then we are in our proper sphere in asking that something be done by other branches of the Government.

The most important question of this hour is to Americanize the American Nation. You can not do it except by education. The school systems in this country are breaking down, and they need a national stimulant, not regulation; and no one wants to interfere with the educational facilities of the States. Millions of anarchistic magazines are going through the mails of this country, poisoning the souls of millions, preaching the doctrine of despair and hopelessness. It is said that America sleeps until the eleventh hour, and then she awakes. America has slept on this question until the eleventh hour, but now she is awake, and the people know that it is a question for the Nation to solve, and they are going to help solve it. They are going to meet the doctrine of despair by the doctrine of hope; they are going to meet the doctrine of untruth by the doctrine of truth; and these people are going to see the light and know the truth, and the truth will make them free.

We have heard a good deal about Thomas Jefferson in these discussions—Thomas Jefferson, the man who, when he came to prepare the epitaph for his tombstone, forgot that he had been governor, that he had been Secretary of State, that he had been minister to France, that he had twice been President of the United States; he forgot all that in his great life's work, but he remembered what he had done for freedom, and liberty, and education, and he prepared that epitaph:

Here was buried  
Thomas Jefferson,  
Author of the Declaration of  
American Independence,  
of  
the statute of Virginia  
for religious freedom, and  
father of the University  
of Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson was not afraid of education. Thomas Jefferson must have turned in his grave when he heard men on this floor argue that there was no need of education, and that really it was a bad thing.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. No Senator has said we needed no education. Senators who have opposed the bill have said it should come from the States; but no Senator has said there was no need for education.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Mississippi has not said it.

Mr. HARRISON. No; and I have not heard it said.

Mr. KENYON. But I still say it has been said by Senators on this floor during this debate.

Mr. President, I perhaps feel more deeply on this than I should. I do not intend to impugn the motives of any man. There is one town in the steel district of 23,000 inhabitants where only four or five thousand could speak the English language. I feel that we have to get away from this polyglot, boarding-house idea of this country; we have to face the issue and make this a one-language Nation, and that the English

language; and if these aliens will not learn our language, they can not become good citizens, and they will have to go back to other lands for which they care more than for this. This bill will mean more returns to the Nation in better citizenship than any bill passed for many a day. I insert as part of my remarks a letter to Senator Colt from the National India Rubber Co., of Bristol, R. I. It is full of good thought on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Their being no objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL INDIA RUBBER CO.,  
Bristol, R. I., January 24, 1920.

HON. LE BARON B. COLT,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I noticed in the Tribune last night some remarks made by you in the debate on the Kenyon Americanization bill in the Senate, and as I am very much interested in this bill I would like to have a copy of the Record showing your remarks in full.

I know that I have spoken to you a good many times about the Americanization work we do here, and for your information I want to say that at the present time we have 160 pupils in our Americanization school. No compulsion whatever is used with regard to our employees attending this school. The school hours are from 8 in the morning to 5 at night, and two teachers act as instructors. Each class attends school five hours a week—that is, an hour each day.

During the month of December our attendance averaged 98 per cent, so that you can see the great interest that the employees take in this themselves. Some of the classes for two or three months back have had 100 per cent attendance, which is really remarkable.

Of course, instruction is held on company time, and the employees do not lose anything thereby, but it would be a treat to you if you could see these classes in operation and the interest and eagerness with which the pupils follow the work of the teachers.

We have just started in a new class of 16 men, who have not been in this country over two weeks, most of them Portuguese who arrived on the last boat in Providence from the Azores. They could not speak a word of English when they got here. In five days they have made remarkable strides, being able to talk quite a little, tell their own name, where they live, who they work for, and to pick out various objects around the class room and call them by name in English.

I agree heartily with your remarks on compulsion, and I think we have a great problem before us, which is really one for the general betterment of the whole community.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

ANDREW W. ANTHONY,  
Industrial Relations Manager.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has prepared an amendment to the bill which meets with my entire approval, covering the matter which I discussed this afternoon. I call the attention of the Senate to that fact, so that when the amendment is presented, after we begin voting, Senators will understand that it is entirely satisfactory all around.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the omission of a word in his proposed amendment. The amendment, as I caught it, was:

The foregoing shall apply to the residents of the Panama Canal Zone.

It seems to me that the word "also" is left out; that it should read "shall also apply."

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I should like to have that modification made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed modification.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "shall," insert the word "also," so that it will read:

The foregoing shall also apply to the residents of the Panama Canal Zone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this amendment is a bill that has already been introduced in the House; it was referred to the committee, the committee reported it to the House, and it is now on the calendar of the House for consideration at a very early date.

I see that the hour of 4 o'clock has arrived, and I can take no more time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock has arrived. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. NORRIS. May we have the amendment reported?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the promotion of the public schools in the instruction of candidates for citizenship now being carried on by the Division of Citizenship Training of the Bureau of Naturalization is hereby extended to include all persons of the age of 16 years and upward who shall attend classes of instruction conducted or maintained by any civic, educational, community, racial, or other organization, under the supervision of the public-school authorities, and the provisions of the ninth subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 596), as amended by the act of May 9, 1918 (40 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 542), are hereby made applicable to this added authority. In dis-

charging this additional authority the director of citizenship is also authorized to disseminate information regarding the institutions of the United States Government in such manner as will best stimulate loyalty to those institutions, making use of the means heretofore provided and through use of pictures, slides, and motion pictures. The motion pictures and motion-picture negatives in the possession of the various branches of the Government of an educational nature may also be available for these purposes. In this work the aid of civic, educational, community, racial, and other organizations may be secured by the director of citizenship, who shall compile statistical information as to aliens in their relation to citizenship. The foregoing shall also apply to the residents of the Panama Canal Zone.

Sec. 2. There is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 to carry out the foregoing provisions and purposes of this act, including expenses incidental thereto, and for personal services in the District of Columbia, to be available to June 30, 1921, and until expended. The amounts hereby appropriated shall be in addition to all other allotments for positions in the work of the Division of Citizenship Training heretofore made from appropriations for the Bureau of Naturalization.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. In section 1, in that part of the amendment which reads "the motion pictures and motion-picture negatives in the possession of the various branches of the Government shall also be available for these purposes," I move to strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may" and after the word "Government" and before the word "may" to insert the words "of an educational nature," so that the sentence will read:

The motion pictures and motion-picture negatives in the possession of the various branches of the Government of an educational nature may also be available for these purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. That amendment is thoroughly agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question then is on the amendment as modified.

On a division the amendment as modified was rejected.

Mr. KING. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 5, page 1, after the word "of" and before the word "illiterates," insert the word "alien," so as to read "cooperate with the Federal States in the education of alien illiterates."

The bill is ostensibly for the Americanization of aliens, but it is now sought to be used as an entering wedge for the United States to take charge of the educational work of the States.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand there is to be no debate on any amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is to be no debate. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of section 3 as amended add the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used to increase the compensation now provided for any position or office or person or official in said Interior Department or Bureau of Education: And provided further, That no compensation or salaries paid out of said sum shall be in excess of such as may be paid to employees of the Government in other departments of the Government for like or similar services.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. On page 1, in line 3, I move to strike out the word "Interior" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Labor" and to strike out the words "Bureau of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "division of citizenship training," so that as amended the section will read:

That the Secretary of Labor, through the Division of Citizenship Training, is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the several States in the education of alien illiterates—

And so forth. The amendment merely transfers the work from the Department of the Interior to the Citizenship Division of the Department of Labor.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I reserve the right to offer an amendment to subdivision (e), page 5, when we get into the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to reserve any right; he has that right.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to offer an amendment to an amendment that was adopted in Committee of the Whole. I understand I can not offer it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can reserve a separate vote on that.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to do that.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has reserved for a separate vote the amendment to

subdivision (e) of section 5, lines 13 and 14. The question is on concurring in all other amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lines 13 and 14, page 5, strike out the words "and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. NORRIS. I was interrupted when the Chair was stating something with regard to other amendments. I wanted to reserve a separate vote on one other committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator did not reserve it.

Mr. NORRIS. I was interrupted and did not hear the Chair, and do not know now whether the Chair has reserved it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has stated that all amendments except this one were concurred in.

Mr. NORRIS. I intended to ask that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, on page 5, paragraph (e), be reserved for a separate vote, but I understand it is the same amendment reserved by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it is the same amendment, but I desire to do differently from what the Senator from Nebraska wishes to do.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On lines 13 and 14, page 5 of the reprint, strike out the words "and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. HARRISON. I think it was an inadvertence that that was left in the amendment. It is stricken out in other places.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. My amendment applies to the same amendment, although it is in the form of a substitute for it. I presume the vote would first come on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the opinion of the Chair. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for paragraph (e), page 5 of the reprint, striking out all of paragraph (e) and inserting what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed substitute will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. As a substitute for subsection (e) of section 5 insert:

(e) Provide by law for free schools that can be attended by residents of a State of any age, who are unable to speak, read, or write the English language, where instruction in the English language can be received for not less than 200 hours per annum.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 5, line 8, after the word "disqualified," it is proposed to insert "or whose attendance on the classes of instruction hereinafter mentioned is otherwise impossible or impracticable."

Mr. SMOOT. May we have paragraph (e) as amended read in full in order that we may really see what it means?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Including the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Including the amendment just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the language as it will be if the amendment referred to by the Senator from Utah be adopted.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

(e) Require all resident persons, whether citizens of the United States or aliens, 16 years of age or over and under 21 years of age, who are not physically or mentally disqualified or whose attendance on the classes of instruction hereinafter mentioned is otherwise impossible or impracticable, and who are illiterate or unable to understand, speak, read, or write the English language, to attend classes of instruction for not less than 200 hours per annum until they shall have completed a specified course prepared by the department of education or chief school officer of the State and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, That this shall not apply to those who are in this country temporarily for sojourn or business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment. Shall it be engrossed and read the third time?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.



The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass? Mr. KENYON. On the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement which I have heretofore made with regard to my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. NEWBERRY's name was called). The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] is paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. KIRBY (when the name of Mr. ROBINSON was called). The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably detained on account of illness. I understand if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who is detained from the Chamber on account of sickness. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. McCORMICK (after having voted in the affirmative). I note that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], with whom I am paired, is still absent from the Chamber. Therefore I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] voted? The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina. In his absence I withdraw my vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], which I have heretofore announced, to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PITTMAN. I announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is confined to his residence by illness. As has already been announced, he is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. If the Senator from Wyoming were here, I am informed that he would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained by illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 14, as follows:

## YEAS—26.

Ball	Hitchcock	New	Smith, Ga.
Brandagee	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Colt	Kenyon	Phelan	Sutherland
Cummins	Kirby	Phipps	Townsend
Curtis	Lenroot	Pittman	Wadsworth
France	Lodge	Pointdexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	McKellar	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott

## NAYS—14.

Calder	Gronna	Reed	Trammell
Chamberlain	Harris	Sherman	Williams
Dial	Harrison	Smith, S. C.	
Frelinghuysen	King	Smoot	

## NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Simmons
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Borah	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Swanson
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Edge	Kendrick	Owen	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Warren
Fall	Knox	Penrose	Watson
Fernald	La Follette	Ransdell	
Fletcher	McCormick	Robinson	
Gay	McCumber	Shields	

So the bill was passed.

## AWARDS OF NAVAL DECORATIONS.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 285, being Order of Business 333 on the calendar.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PITTMAN. Is the question debatable, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not care, Mr. President, to discuss the question of the propriety of taking up this matter at this late hour in the afternoon, but I do desire to submit a few remarks upon the resolution itself. It contemplates the employment of an attorney by the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate charged with the duty of inquiring into the matters set forth in the more or less famous letter of Admiral Sims, directed to the Secretary of the Navy, touching what he speaks of as the policy, tactics, strategy, and administration of the Navy Department.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, if I can, that no suggestion has been made of any corruption on the part of the Navy Department or anybody connected with it; there has been no charge, for instance, of extravagant expenditures upon the part of the Navy Department; no suggestion of any character concerning changes that are necessary in the laws in relation to the Navy Department or to the Navy. The whole matter turns, as stated in Admiral Sims's letter, upon the question of errors of policy, tactics, strategy, and administration that were committed by our Navy. I read from paragraph 3 of the letter, as follows:

In this respect it is particularly important that a just estimate be made of the errors of policy, tactics, strategy, and administration that were committed by our Navy.

Mr. President, I am somewhat at a loss to understand just exactly what is to be accomplished by this investigation, just exactly what the Senate can do in the matter, or is expected to do in the matter. Investigations are often conducted with a view to determining whether corruption has existed in any department of the Government, or whether there has been extravagance in the expenditures of the public funds. Other investigations are conducted with a view, primarily, to informing the committees dealing with legislation, and, secondarily, to advise the Senate itself concerning matters, in order that it may be enabled wisely and with information to deal with some particular subject; but nothing of that kind is suggested here.

It will appear from the letter of Admiral Sims that in the early part of the year 1917—indeed, before we declared war—he was sent to London as a special representative of the Navy Department and was subsequently appointed to the position of chief command of our naval forces abroad. He complains in

this letter that he was not given the powers that were ordinarily attendant upon such a position as he held; that he was restricted in the exercise of authority which he felt was essential to the correct discharge of the duties of the place with which he was entrusted. In other words, as is perfectly well understood, the General Board of the Navy, which sat here in Washington, assumed to exercise certain authority over the operations of the Navy abroad and, through the Secretary of the Navy, it conferred certain powers upon the commander in chief there. He insists that the retention of so much authority practically by the General Board of the Navy and the refusal to give him the unlimited power which he thinks he ought to have exercised was an unwise thing to do from the standpoint of naval strategy and tactics.

Mr. President, the question as to whether the General Board acted wisely or unwisely—whether, judged from the standpoint of the correct conduct of naval warfare, they were right or Admiral Sims was right in the matter—is the issue that this committee is called upon to investigate. That, as a matter of course, is a thing that is largely a matter of opinion between contending naval experts. Undoubtedly the board will come forward and justify, as best it can, the policy which it announced and which it pursued limiting the powers of Admiral Sims. Admiral Sims and his friends will come forward and advance the other theory as the correct one to be observed in the conduct of naval operations.

What is there about this that calls for the employment of a lawyer? In the first place, as everyone knows, two-thirds of the members of the committee are lawyers. I think perhaps four out of five of the members of the committee are lawyers; and apparently, from the examination of Admiral Sims, so far as it has gone, he is quite able to take care of himself and to expatiate upon his peculiar views concerning what constitutes naval strategy without very much prompting from any lawyer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there were anything in the case that called upon us to employ counsel for Admiral Sims's side of this controversy, would not exactly the same thing call upon us to employ counsel for the other side, to get the side of the board of strategy?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not entirely advised about that. I presume probably the Judge Advocate General's department would be able to supply counsel; but I am not advised as to whether they would represent Admiral Sims's side of the controversy or the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; and if we are going to employ counsel outside of the committee and outside of the Navy and if we are not aware of the fact that the Judge Advocate General's office of the Navy Department would represent the other side, then we would be employing counsel for one side and no counsel for the other.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It would seem so; but in any case, Mr. President, I am quite at a loss to understand what there is about this that calls for the employment of counsel. Nobody's reputation for integrity or for faithful administration of the duties of his office appears to be involved in any way, shape, or form. It is not even contended, it is not even intimated throughout the letter anywhere that the matter passed beyond a simple question as to which was the advisable way to conduct that part of the war. I suppose probably the Navy Board will testify about the matter, and if they were in any manner overruled in their conclusions concerning things by the Secretary of the Navy—a thing that seems quite inconceivable—they will be able to say so and throw the responsibility wherever it belongs. But more, Mr. President; I submit that it is questionable whether there is any proper jurisdictional basis for an inquiry of this kind at all. I do not know why we should conduct it. For the enlightenment of the general public concerning these two contending theories of naval strategy? In all reasonable probability, I suppose, the contestants upon both sides—those favoring Admiral Sims and those taking the other view about it—will exploit their views through the newspapers and magazines of the country, the same as has occurred in the past. For my part, I do not see why the public would not be just exactly as well advised about the matter in that way as they will be through a congressional investigation.

This, Mr. President, is not the first time in our history when a difference of opinion has existed concerning the wisdom of proceeding in one way or proceeding in another way in reference to either our naval or our military operations. If Admiral Sims claims that his theory concerning what ought to be done and

what ought not to be done is correct, I can not understand why he should not be at entire liberty to use the ordinary avenues through which the public mind is reached. The magazine publishers no doubt would be very glad to get an article from him exploiting his theory; and in all reasonable probability Admiral Benson, who, of course, was immediately responsible for the orders put out to Admiral Sims, and the limitations upon his authority, would be accorded an opportunity through some other magazine to exploit his peculiar views concerning the correct way in which this question of naval strategy should be resolved. Why should not the public get their information about the matter in that way? In the first place, why should there be an investigation of that particular thing at all?

Of course, we all understand that these matters are usually tinged with a political coloring of one kind or another, and we all understand that from the beginning of his administration Secretary Daniels has been the subject of attack. His administration of the office has been undergoing criticism from the time he took hold until perhaps a year or two before the war commenced, when even so virulent an assailant as George Harvey apologized publicly through his paper for the assaults that he had theretofore made upon the Secretary. But now an opportunity is presented, in the estimation of some gentlemen, to renew that attack for political purposes and to subserve political ends. That is perfectly well understood.

Mr. President, why should the Government of the United States pay any money out of its Treasury for the purpose of assisting in exploiting either one or the other of these two contending theories? It will be observed, as I have suggested, that there is not an intimation that there is anything wrong with our naval code. It is not suggested that we must amend our legislation in some particular or other. It is a mere matter of this contention between naval experts as to just exactly how the Navy ought to be handled under the circumstances which confronted it at the outset of the war. I do not think this can be justified under any circumstances or conditions.

But, Mr. President, we are confronted in every effort to enlist Government activities in any direction whatever with a rigid program of economy by the dominant party in both branches of Congress. Some highly necessary appropriations for carrying on Government work in the State of Montana must be refused because it is asserted that the Treasury is in such a state that the most rigid economy must be exercised; and every time anything in the nature of an appropriation bill comes up we are told all about the desperate state of the Treasury, how we are running away behind, and how it will be necessary to impose new and heavier burdens of taxes upon the people; and yet we are here with a proposition of employing some high-priced lawyer, at some fee to be measured by his great reputation, to take care of this controversy that ordinarily would be solved and determined by the public, so far as it is necessary to determine it, as the matter is presented through the public press and through the magazines of the country.

I do not believe that this suggestion of the employment of an attorney to conduct this investigation can be justified upon any sound basis whatever, and I hope very sincerely that the resolution will not be adopted. Nobody who knows anything about the matter or who has given any consideration to it has the slightest fear that Admiral Sims is not able to tell his story, and to tell it with entire fullness and in complete detail. He will undoubtedly pick up every one of these charges that he has made, from beginning to end, and he will tell all the facts about them, so far as he knows about the facts; and when the other side is heard about the matter, I apprehend that the public will know pretty nearly all there is.

I submit, Mr. President, that a lawyer will not be able to bring out any facts that will elucidate this question or that will be of any substantial benefit to the public in making a just estimate of the controversy, if it is a proper subject for investigation by the committee.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. HALE. In view of the lateness of the hour, will the Senator not allow my motion to take up this resolution prevail? If he will do that, I shall be very glad to ask for an executive session, and the Senator can complete his remarks to-morrow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have finished what I desired to say on the subject. I am advised, however, that another member of the committee desires to be heard on the subject before we vote on it.

Mr. HALE. I hope that the other member of the committee will agree to my suggestion.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I will state that, as a member of the committee, I will not consent to the suggestion. Of course, if the Senator rose for the purpose of making a speech, or any-



thing of that kind, I should be very glad to yield the floor to him at the present time, but there will be objection to proceeding to vote on his motion before it is discussed sufficiently for those present at least to understand it.

Mr. HALE. Very well, Mr. President, I will withdraw my motion at the present time, but I now announce that to-morrow at the close of the routine morning business I shall again move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

#### RURAL HOMES.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar the bill (S. 3477) to increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes. I would like to have it passed this evening, if possible, so that we can get it over to the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a bill that will not take one cent out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know, but what does it provide?

Mr. SMOOT. The title of the bill is, "To increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was it unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and it is recommended in the highest terms by the department. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior specifically refers to the legislation in his annual report.

Mr. KING. It has a formidable title. I would like to learn what the bill is about.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is any objection, I will not ask for its consideration. I would like to have the bill read. It will take just a few moments to read.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the bill.

The reading clerk read the bill as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Reclamation Service, is authorized to investigate and determine the feasibility of developing tracts of land in private ownership within any State or Territory, by reclamation and otherwise, for the purpose of subdividing the land and disposing of the same in farms and parcels at reasonable prices.

SEC. 2. That after the Secretary of the Interior has determined the feasibility of a project, he is authorized, through the Reclamation Service, to develop the land to such extent, and dispose of the same in farms and parcels in such manner and upon such terms as to him shall be deemed most feasible and practicable.

SEC. 3. That no moneys of the United States shall be expended for any of the purposes of this act, nor shall either the investigation or development of any project be commenced or any obligation incurred therefor, until a contract shall have first been made by the Secretary of the Interior with the owner or owners of the land, providing for the payment in advance of sufficient moneys to meet the cost of such investigation or development. The moneys provided by every such contract shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States as a trust fund, and shall be disbursed by a duly authorized fiscal officer of the Government under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with the terms of such contract.

SEC. 4. That every contract for development of a project shall provide, among other things, that the developed farms and parcels shall be sold to persons who desire to occupy the same as homes at the actual cost of the land and the development thereof plus a definite reasonable profit to the owner or owners stated in advance therein. All contracts for the purchase of farms and parcels shall be made for, and the moneys due thereunder shall be payable to, the owner or owners of the land or their assigns.

Mr. KING. I hope my colleague will not ask for the consideration of the bill this evening.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, if there is any objection to it, I will not.

Mr. KING. It may be all right; it looks very innocent on its face; but I am afraid that back of it are lurking some dangers, and I would like to have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is the Senator speaking of the League of Nations?

Mr. KING. There are none lurking there that the Senator has not already discovered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

#### TREATY WITH SALVADOR.

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom.

The SENATE:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States

and Salvador, signed January 28, 1919, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed January 28, 1919, between the United States and Salvador, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 27, 1919.

The United States of America and the Republic of Salvador being desirous to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Salvador, Rafael Zaldivar, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary for the Republic of Salvador in the United States of America,

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

#### ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants, and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the High Contracting Parties may operate as commercial travelers either personally or by means of agents or employees within the jurisdiction of the other High Contracting Party on obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the High Contracting Parties shall be engaged in war, it reserves to itself the right to prevent from operating within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this treaty, or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

#### ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants, and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be viséed by the consul of the country in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

#### ARTICLE III.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

#### ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced, in such manner that they can not be put to other uses, shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

#### ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six (6) months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

#### ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the despatch of samples.

#### ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be consid-

ered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

## ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agencies which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

## ARTICLE IX.

Any concessions affecting any of the provisions of the present treaty that may hereafter be granted by either High Contracting Party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

## ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or San Salvador within two years, or sooner if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the High Contracting Parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned, this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunder affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this 28th day of January, 1919.

[SEAL.]

FRANK L. POLK.

[SEAL.]

R. ZALDIVAR.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1920.*

## JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Robert E. Mattingly, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia, vice Milton Strasburger, resigned.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer):

Ray Longfellow Schoppe, of Vermont, vice Ferdinand Westdahl.

The following-named officers of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineers (by promotion from aid):

Lowrie Wilson Burdette, of South Carolina, vice L. M. Mower.

William McCaslan Scaife, of South Carolina, vice A. G. Katz.

Earl Oscar Heaton, of New York, vice H. W. Hemple.

The following-named officers of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be aids (by promotion from deck officers):

Robert Francis Anthony Studds, of the District of Columbia, vice L. W. Burdette.

Louis Morris Zeskind, of Maryland, vice L. M. Scaife.

Henry Caperton Warwick, of West Virginia, vice E. O. Heaton.

Jacob Stanley Rosenthal, of Maryland, vice A. P. Ratte.

Maurice Kagan, of Massachusetts, vice E. F. Lewis.

## APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Col. Henry C. Haines, assistant adjutant and inspector, to be the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from the 15th day of January, 1920.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1920.*

## ASSISTANT UNITED STATES TREASURERS.

Arthur Espy to be assistant treasurer, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Robert G. Hilton to be assistant treasurer, Baltimore, Md.

## APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Morris Sabath to be appraiser of merchandise, customs collection district No. 39, Chicago.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

E. F. Aydlett to be United States attorney, eastern district of North Carolina.

## POSTMASTERS.

## MICHIGAN.

Charles J. Kazilek, Alpha.

Thomas Hefferman, Baldwin.

Guy F. Hackman, Burr Oak.

Charles Myers, Clarkston.

Frank E. Richards, Clarksville.

Arthur W. Muir, Clinton.

James O. LaBerge, East Tawas.

Clara Woodruff, Freeland.

David H. Allen, Gallen.

Floyd J. Gibbs, Ithaca.

Frank T. Swarthout, Laingsburg.

George S. Stout, Lake City.

Leo Paquette, L'Anse.

Roydon W. Cooper, Levering.

Harry W. Denham, Litchfield.

Frank H. Koebbe, Manchester.

Leslie D. Madill, Midland.

Joseph R. Gump, Milan.

Thomas H. Berryman, Mohawk.

Mark B. Hawes, Parma.

Wilda P. Hartingh, Pinconning.

Samuel B. Brant, Pittsford.

Milburn G. Hill, Plymouth.

Frank W. Thompson, Reese.

Edward M. Cosgrove, Saginaw.

Jens H. Wester, Sawyer.

Martin C. Musolf, Tawas City.

Wellington E. Reid, Ubly.

John C. Yeakey, Wayland.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Eugene T. Hooker, Aurora.

DeLambert P. Stowe, Belmont.

John L. Miller, Concord.

Edgar S. Woodley, Creswell.

Myron L. Moore, Granite Falls.

William C. Newborn, Grifton.

Samuel W. Finch, Lexington.

William C. Pope, Marshall.

William O. Connor, Mars Hill.

John H. Sanders, Middlesex.

Robert F. Crooks, Murphy.

Harvey E. Garrison, North Charlotte.

George R. Upchurch, Norwood.

George N. Taylor, Roanoke Rapids.

Cyril L. Walker, Roper.

Henry G. Early, Rosehill.

William Watson, Swanquarter.

William C. Graham, Tabor.

Jacob B. Brown, Vanceboro.

Nannie McI. Moore, Warrenton.

Lula E. Parker, West Raleigh.

Millard F. Bumgarner, Wilkesboro.

## APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## INFANTRY.

*To be colonel.*

Lutz Wahl.

*To be lieutenant colonels.*

Edward T. Hartmann.

Frederick B. Shaw.

*To be majors.*

Frederic G. Kellond.

Herbert L. Evans.

Harry D. Mitchell.



*To be captains.*

Mark W. Clark.  
David S. Rumbough.  
Francis J. Heraty.  
Donovan Swanton.  
Francis A. Macon, jr.  
Laurence B. Keiser.  
Homer C. Brown.  
Clare H. Armstrong.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 26, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, we thank Thee that this is Thy world, that Thou art in it, ever ready to inspire, uphold, and guide those who seek Thee in spirit and in truth, in every laudable enterprise.

The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein:

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place?

He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.

The world is full of infidelity, atheism, materialism. All sorts of wild speculations are rife; and good men, strong men, wise and holy men, are called upon from the fountain of life to assert themselves and follow the precepts and example of the world's great Redeemer, to be purified, ennobled, sanctified, if they would save it from disaster. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 24, and of Sunday, January 25, were read and approved.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the files the papers in the case of H. R. 9208, which I introduced in the Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse action having been taken thereon by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which it was referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw from the files papers in the case to which he refers. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, where do they go?

Mr. WHEELER. There was no action taken by the Military Committee on the case, and I simply ask to withdraw the papers from the files.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### ADMINISTRATION OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, by direction of that committee, reported the bill H. R. 12012, concerning the administration of the pension laws in claims for pension of persons who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and by the widows of such persons, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLANTON reserved all points of order on the bill.

### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I present the following resolution:

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, any section of the bill as reported; and, upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it shall be in order to insert in any part of the bill any provision reported as part of the bill and heretofore ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. After a bill has been submitted to the House, the House has resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering that bill, general debate has been had on the bill, the bill has been read for amendment under the five-minute rule, various provisions of the bill have been adopted, and there are still remaining portions of the bill left for consideration, I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order

and not the province of the Rules Committee to come in at this stage of the legislation and make in order provisions of the bill which have gone out on points of order in Committee of the Whole, which is sought to be done in this case by the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the Committee on Rules has that privilege before the House acts on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear the parliamentary inquiry; the gentleman can make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule is to enable the majority of the House to do what it wishes to do in the further consideration of the bill. It is a simple matter and follows the precedents of the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the steering committee decided that this is the best thing to do?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The steering committee has not consulted with the members of the Rules Committee, so far as I know.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said on Saturday that on all important questions they had finally reached an agreement. I wanted to know whether you were proceeding regularly or not, or whether you were proceeding without consulting the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think we are proceeding in the utmost harmony.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am afraid that you are acting too independently. Does the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] know that this rule is to be brought in?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He does.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This rule was brought in for the reason that points of order have been made against a number of provisions carried in the bill for years by members of the minority side of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is true; the sole purpose is to continue legislation that has been found necessary in years past.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman from Kansas think that the Rules Committee is taking on a legislative function?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not at all. This is a question of procedure, a question of permitting the House to do what it wants to do over the objection of any single Member of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but any single Member has a right to make a point of order against an item that is not properly in the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is under the general rules of the House, but the Committee on Rules brings in a rule to change the general rules of the House for the specific purpose of enabling the House to do what it wants to do in this particular instance, notwithstanding the rules.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do not these gentlemen who are running this Foreign Affairs Committee get up a bill that is in order?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] could give a better answer to that question than I. He brought in bills of similar import to this during the time that he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be true, but that is no answer—that somebody, somewhere, in the long lapse of years has done something that you want to imitate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In any event, it is the purpose of this rule to let the House do what it wishes with respect to the bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Sixty-fourth Congress, which was Democratic, presented the same rule for the Post Office bill, the Agricultural bill, the District bill, and one other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. If you rely constantly on what the Democrats did in Congress, does the gentleman not think he ought

to bring in a resolution saying that the Democrats were dead right about all these things? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to put the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], chairman of the Rules Committee, on notice with respect to all the other appropriation supply bills they are to bring in here. He would better get rules making all unlawful matters in order and keep the rules in his hip pocket, because I am going to make points of order against every single unlawful provision that appears in any and all of these appropriation bills.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, the gentleman from Kansas is always ready for the gentleman from Texas on matters of that kind.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Missouri, the leader of the minority, asked a question of the gentleman from Kansas, and the gentleman from Kansas referred him to me to answer the question. The question was why this bill was not so framed as to make all the items it carries in order. I would say to the gentleman that the bill has carried items that are subject to a point of order for many years—all of these items, so far as I know—but I believe they are meritorious appropriations and ought to be carried in the bill. And while the gentleman is legislating for the Committee on Foreign Affairs I think his committee ought to legislate to make these items permanent law, so that in the future these very meritorious appropriations would not be subject to the whim of any single Member of this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think it is only fair to state that during the time the Republicans were in the minority they did not make the points of order.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. We wrestled here for days with points of order raised by the Republicans.

Mr. MONDELL. I think not with this bill.

Mr. FLOOD. With this bill; yes—the Diplomatic and Consular bill. I am not mistaken about that, because I had charge of the bill. I had a great deal of trouble getting the bill through on account of these points of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman suggests that this rule will give the Committee on Foreign Affairs an opportunity to permit the majority to vote upon such measures as they care to put in the bill. Would this include allowing a majority of the House, if they wish to do so, to attach Armenia and Georgia to the Persian legation and make the minister to Persia minister to Armenia and Georgia and Persia, so as to accord the same representation to Armenia and Georgia as they have given to Poland and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It would not be in order under this rule. We are making in order matters that have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the rule, what is going to become of the items that we have already passed over?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] these items will be reinserted in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. And reread?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. GARD. Has that process ever been attempted before, where we have proceeded under the general rules of the House and ruled out certain items and then gone back under a special rule making the things in order?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, yes. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am always anxious to please my genial friend from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] when he makes inquiries as to my position in regard to matters. He asked whether the chairman of the steering committee had been consulted in regard to this rule.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I have very brief time and I am going to answer the gentleman's inquiry. The steering committee was consulted—at least the chairman of the steering committee was consulted, and while the chairman of the steering committee is entirely nonpartisan in his view of things, he is not averse to taking proper advantage of a situation thrust upon

him by the opposition. He was of opinion that it was not wise to bring a rule in, and so suggested to the gentlemen of this committee, whose bill was being shot to pieces by gentlemen belonging to the party of the administration. His opinion was that from a political standpoint the thing to do was to let the administration side of this House shoot this administration bill to pieces by points of order, if they wanted to do it. There is no pork in this bill; there is no local benefit served by this bill; there is no special class or community benefited by this bill. This is a Government bill—the Government bill, the administration bill of the Congress—having to do wholly with foreign affairs. I doubt if there is a Republican who will be affected by any of these appropriations. The men and women who are to be paid under these appropriations are Democrats, practically all of them.

The committee brought this bill in as the Democratic side has been bringing it in year after year, subject to points of order that were never made by the Republican side, and gentlemen on the Democratic side, from what motive I do not know and can not fathom, knowing that the items are meritorious, knowing that they are essential, knowing they are urged by their administration, nevertheless strike them out, in my opinion, some of them, not because gentlemen have examined the matter themselves and are informed in respect to the items but because somebody has told them that they are subject to points of order. Anyone that is allowed to get near enough can throw monkey wrenches into machinery. It does not require knowledge or information or brain power to throw monkey wrenches into the legislative machinery, as certain gentlemen on the Democratic side have been doing. If my advice were followed, there might not be any rule here, and every time a point of order was made on the administration side of this House I would have the attention of the country challenged to the fact that gentlemen were so unfair to their own Government and their own administration that they would not even give the House an opportunity to pass upon the validity and the virtue and propriety of these items.

That is what I should have done. But the committee did not agree with my view of it. Perhaps they took a more statesmanlike view of it than I did. I did not object to the rule being brought in. In fact, when the Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee expressed a desire for a rule I helped them get it. I think my view may have been a trifle partisan, because I would have challenged the attention of the country to the utterly indefensible attitude of certain gentlemen on the Democratic side relative to this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very much surprised and disappointed at the position which my collaborator and, I might say, partner in economy, the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], has taken in his remarks. I never thought for one moment that when I went "in cahoots" with him some time ago to put through an economy program that he and myself would ever part company, and that he would ever get so indignant and excited and red faced over the matter. But I see that he has changed his views on economy. He is not going to have any "program of economy" from now on. But I was gratified to hear from him that there is one committee of this House—the Rules Committee—that is not going to tolerate any overlordism from the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. He says he told the Rules Committee not to report out this rule; to let these Democrats and everybody else make all the points of order they wanted. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the other members of the Rules Committee, perhaps, said, "No; you can boss the Ways and Means Committee and humiliate Chairman FORDNEY and Mr. GREEN of Iowa; you can make the Naval Committee bend the knee; you can make the Rivers and Harbors Committee tremble with fear and do your bidding; but here is one committee, Mr. MONDELL," says Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, "here is one committee that you dare not and can not bulldoze; you shall not be their master. I know you do not want us to report this out, but we are going to do it in spite of you." Do you not imagine that Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas talked that way to him?

I am glad we have one committee that is independent of Mr. MONDELL and the steering committee. Let me tell the gentleman from Wyoming that I was absolutely sincere, of course [laughter], on Saturday when I came down expecting to have the hearty cooperation of the gentleman. I never made but one point of order, and it was against an item, I think, of \$400,000. I made a point of order but reserved it in order for the chairman to



enlighten the House; I made and reserved the point of order trying to get a reduction in the item down to \$250,000. Mr. MONDELL was not in the House at the time, and I took it that he was absolutely sincere and conscientious on the economy program, and I said, "Here, before the war, even up to 1917, we only appropriated \$150,000 for that item, and surely we ought to cut it down and appropriate not over \$250,000, a year and a half after the armistice." Looking around and seeing the gentleman was not here, and knowing he would have made the point of order if he had been here and that we would have cooperated together, I made the point of order and I tried to reduce the item. I told the chairman if he would reduce it to \$250,000 I would not make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman might have made a motion to reduce the item, and I might have, but he will have an opportunity to make a motion to reduce the item now, and I want him to do it if he is here.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will take the gentleman's place and do it if he is not here. I know the gentleman was sincere in saying that he is opposed to this rule. If he will help fight it, he will defeat it. I want to ask him, since he is opposed to the rule, against it for politics and against it because of the injustice of the rule, is he going to help fight it? Is he going to make a speech against this rule and ask these Republicans to vote against it?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say I was against it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You said you opposed it, as the notes will show, and if you had your way you would let the Democrats or anybody else make all the points of order they wanted. If you stand up to that, you will defeat this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that the Democratic members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs raised no point of order against this bill; that none of them reserved the right to raise points of order against it, and they did not do it. The only criticism made here by minority members of that committee was in the fact that an attempt was made to claim great economy on this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself called attention to that fact. But we were for this bill and all the items in it.

Another thing I want to call attention to is the fact that gentlemen on the other side have said that no points of order were made or reserved against this bill by gentlemen on that side during the eight years when the bill was in charge of a committee the majority of whom were Democrats. That is not according to the record at all. Points of order were made or reserved against it, and we wrestled here with Republicans day after day in order to get this bill in such shape that it would satisfy the demands of the department and supply our foreign service with the means sufficient to run and develop in accordance with the best interests of this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was it ever necessary to bring in a rule to make any of the provisions of the bill in order?

Mr. FLOOD. No; because we worked along with the bill in the House as best we could, and when it went to the Senate items were frequently reinserted, and the bill was made a law in a proper and orderly way, and not by rules brought in by the Rules Committee. But the Republicans during the consideration of this bill raised or made more points of order when I was chairman of the committee than have been raised against this bill at this time. There were more items against which points of order were raised or made each year of those eight years than have been raised or made during the consideration of this bill by this House.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], in reply to a question asked him, stated that all of these appropriations, eliminated on points of order, would be put back into the bill by the chairman moving to reconsider these sections that had been passed, indicating that it had already been determined by the few men on the Rules Committee what the whole House of Representatives had to do; and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] states that all these points of order were made by Members who were

merely told that the sections were subject to points of order, indicating that they would not have known it if they had not been told.

The gentleman from Wyoming is so used to telling his colleagues on his side of the House what he wants done and what should be done, and having them do it without any question, that he imagines that everybody else on the other side of the House is so controlled. Now, the amounts that were cut out of this bill on points of order were the following: On page 3, the sum of \$134,000; on page 4, the sum of \$438,000; on page 5, the sum of \$15,000, and the sums of \$2,000, \$9,000, and \$1,200; and on page 6, \$15,000 and \$2,000. They are the items. One of these points of order was made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN], and all of the other points of order were made by me, and by same over \$630,000 was temporarily saved to the people of the United States.

I want to submit to my friend from Wyoming, the distinguished leader of the majority, that true economy is more than lip deep; it is more than skin deep. If he wants to save these sums, what must be done? What are these sums of money for? Why, to pay so-called student interpreters, 10 of them to China, a salary of \$1,500 a year each, for what? To learn how to go to school over there and learn the Chinese language. Not only that, but \$200 apiece is appropriated to pay for their tuition. Not only that, but \$600 a year is appropriated for their quarters. And so it is with respect to Turkey. Ten students are paid \$1,500 a year each, and \$200 for tuition and \$600 for quarters. And so it is with Japan. Those students are paid \$1,500 a year each to go to school. You pay them to go to school over there, and pay for their quarters \$600, and pay for their tuition \$200 each; and these are the sums of money that are taken out of the people's Treasury in this crucial time. With a deficit of \$3,000,000,000 staring us in the face, you are paying fellows to go to school in China and Japan and Turkey, and after you educate them over there they will come right back to the United States and commercialize the education we have paid for, and we will get no service whatever from them. There is absolutely nothing that binds them to the service. There is absolutely nothing that guarantees to the United States of America one single dollar of value for the money expended. I want to say that the so-called economy on the majority side of the House is lip deep only.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I just came in and was told that this rule was being considered. As I understand the rule, it does not pass anything but gives the House an opportunity to reject or approve. Is that correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the purpose of the rule. The purpose of the rule is to give the House the opportunity to consider the items reported in this bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. And the strenuous effort of the gentleman from Texas is to seek to take from the House that privilege?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I assume that is the purpose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, while the chairman of the Committee on Rules is on his feet I would like to ask him a question. Does this rule make in order the Irish resolution about freedom for Ireland?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was not referred to in the rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state that the gentleman has six minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to maintain a fight on this floor which can not be sustained. The situation before the Committee on Rules was this: The information we received was that this bill came with a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs; that there was no division of opinion as to the legislation this bill embodies.

For my part I could not imagine just how I could oppose a rule for the consideration of the bill under those circumstances. I must say the rule itself is not drawn as I would have drawn it. Nevertheless, it does bring this legislation before the House. It leaves the bill open for amendment. If the House wishes to reduce any of the items, it can do so by a majority vote. But when one of the great committees of the House asks for a resolution providing for the consideration of a measure, and the information is the bill has a unanimous report, and, moreover, that the bill is a practical redraft of legislation which

was passed by a Democratic Congress, I could not see just how to inaugurate a fight against the rule. Therefore I do not see how I can oppose this rule, and I shall vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, having been on this committee and having attended the hearings for the purpose of determining the amounts that should be incorporated for the various items in this bill, and being most obstreperous on the point of appropriating vast sums of money, I feel that I would like to say a word on this question.

I want to call the attention of the minority side of the House to this fact—and it was the argument that brought me to agree to some of the items in the bill, else I most certainly would have been the obstreperous one on the floor of the House to cut them down. That argument, urged by the Secretary of State and his assistants who appeared before the committee, was this: In order that the Secretary of State and the foreign relations department might function adequately and efficiently at this time, it was necessary to maintain at least a semblance of flexibility in the law, and it would be impossible for the State Department to meet the varying conditions in the European countries at this time, with their unstable governments or unestablished governments in many of the States; it would be impossible for them to meet the conditions arising if the law were drafted with rigid and stringent provisions and held to a certain line. On that plea, and that plea alone, I agreed to many of these items in this bill. As to the question of economy, it has been bandied back and forth about whether we are saving money or not. I want to say to the minority that if I had it my way there would not be any question of doubt about whether we were saving money. I think we are appropriating money in this bill in certain places for which it is questionable whether we will ever get value received. Most certainly, in the light of the way that past appropriations for similar items have been expended, the United States Government has been caused some embarrassment because of mistakes made in our secret diplomacy. I am not in favor of that kind of legislation. I am not in favor of lump sums; but when the Secretary of State at this time, with the affairs of the world as critical as they are, comes before me and says that it is more necessary that this bill carry these items, and in the amounts in which they are carried, than it was during the war, it is not up to me to say that I know more about conditions in Russia or Germany or France or any other country than the men whom your minority party have selected to act in that capacity. I want to appeal to the Democratic side, to ask you, Have you not the same confidence in the men selected by your chief in permitting them to expend this money that we on this side have? I agree with the gentleman in toto that when we get back to normal conditions we ought to establish a law that would not require the President of the United States to have more than \$1,000,000 to spend as he sees fit, to parcel out where he will, to confer favors on whom he will. I am opposed to that kind of legislation, and I want to go on record as saying so.

There is another thing to which I wish to call attention in this particular proposition. The Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, testified before our committee that even with this appropriation, as big as it is, it is not big enough to permit him and the Chief Executive to go out into the highways and byways of life and select men because of their particular qualifications to fill these offices. On the other hand, he testified that before he could select a man to represent this Government in a foreign court, because of the inadequate pay and the enormous expenditures to which these men are put, it is necessary for him to go only into the class of the idle rich to make his selections.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield another minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I want to appeal not only to the minority side but to the majority side. I have no quarrel with a man because he is rich. I wish I were. But I want to ask you if you believe the Government of the United States, a Republic, as it is, can best function when the selection of its representatives for foreign diplomacy is confined to a class of individuals who have already amassed their fortunes? I believe that this Congress, or if not this Congress then the next one, could make no better move than to reorganize our foreign-affairs department in such a way that we can select men to represent us in foreign countries not because of the dollar mark that they may wear but because of their individual and particular fitness for that position. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. Does this bill make any provision for increasing the salaries of our diplomatic and consular representatives?

Mr. BEGG. It does not, because it was thought, both by the Secretary of State and by the committee, to be unwise to undertake to do that at this time; and my reason for introducing that thought is to make clear that I am one man who believes that we are appropriating not too much money in some of these amounts, but appropriating it in the wrong way.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is an unfortunate thing for our brethren of the majority that they have returned to the practice of running the House by special rules, rather than under the general rules provided in the manual. When I first came to Congress some years ago, the practice of special rules was in vogue, and it is a matter of history that that policy was exceedingly disastrous to the Republican Party. Apparently that policy is to be revived.

Some weeks ago the conferees on the agricultural bill brought in a report which, like this bill, represented an excess of authority, so that the House conferees had to appeal to the Rules Committee for a rule to make in order the illegal matter in their report. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in presenting the report of the Rules Committee very clearly indicated that he did not approve of the rule, and intimated in substance that in the future the committees which brought in bills containing matter in excess of their authority need not appeal to the Rules Committee over which he presided, for authority to make this illegal matter in order. The situation to-day duplicates the plight in which the conferees on the agricultural bill found themselves. When the conferees on that bill undertook to include matter that was subject to a point of order, such an undertaking was an illegal assumption of authority. When the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any other committee, undertakes to make appropriations not justified by law, that undertaking is an illegal assumption of authority on their part. There is no difference whatever in principle between the grounds on which a rule has been asked for this bill, and the grounds on which the rule was asked in the case of the agricultural bill. The Members of this body will recall very distinctly the attitude assumed by our friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the chairman of the Rules Committee, on the occasion referred to. I have his remarks before me and if time permitted I would cite them in full.

Mr. Speaker, just as I was coming into the Hall of the House I heard the leader on the Republican side [Mr. MONDELL] say that anybody could throw monkey wrenches into the machinery. Does he think that points of order that are so clear that they are sustained by the Presiding Officer without argument are monkey wrenches thrown into orderly legislative procedure? What is the purpose of our rules save to provide the paths in which the committees of the House must walk? Any committee which exceeds its authority is subject to a point of order when it does so.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. A little later. May I call the attention of this body to the fact that a few days ago, when the Post Office bill was under consideration and an item was reached which was in the interests of the farmers residing on rural routes, and which carried an appropriation of \$300,000 for the development of local business, in the interest of the producer and the consumer, it was a Republican—Mr. TINCER, of Kansas—who threw a monkey wrench into the machinery by making a point of order to that item, and thereby causing it to be stricken from the bill. I have not as yet been advised that the Committee on Rules have been willing to report a rule to give the House an opportunity to vote on that particular proposition. [Applause.]

That is not all in this connection, Mr. Speaker. Not only does this rule undertake to make in order everything remaining in the bill—and there is no more reason why this should be done as to this appropriation bill than in the case of any other bill of like character—but it is actually retroactive, and makes it in order for all the matter that was stricken out on Saturday, on points of order, to be replaced in the bill on motion.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that every committee of this House should conform to the rules of this House. When the Democrats were in power they did not report rules of this sweeping character providing that the contents of an entire bill should be in order. Certainly none of these rules were



retroactive. In a few cases when it was exceedingly desirable that certain legislation should be attached to an appropriation bill, rules were adopted making their provisions in order. [Applause.]

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. GARD. I desire to know whether the rule goes so far as to abrogate the call of the Calendar of the District of Columbia without the intervention of a motion?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; that question will arise on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], the identical provision to which he objects was reported from the Rules Committee by Mr. Dalzell, and is found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3262.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that there were a great many rules in this House reported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell.

Mr. FESS. In reference to the practice of legislating by the Rules Committee, I have just looked over the Record and find that in the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, which was a Democratic Congress, we had this rule in the Post Office bill, in the naval bill, in the District bill, in the Agricultural bill, and in the fortification bill. That was a Democratic Congress.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand there were special items in the bills which the rules referred to, but does the gentleman mean to say that the rules were as sweeping as this and retroactive?

Mr. FESS. Not retroactive, but as sweeping in making the whole bill in order. Now, in reference to the matter referred to by the ex-chairman of the committee, Mr. Flood, I want to say that I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for one Congress, during which time there were appropriation bills reported. I remember that Mr. Stafford, of Wisconsin, offered some objection. I have looked over the Record of the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and I find that he reserved points of order in five different instances, and in all but one withdrew the point of order. The point of order was not made in any case except one. That is found on page 1887 of the Record of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session. The point of order went to the proviso which referred to the payment of certain employees here in the District of Columbia. It did not have anything to do with appropriations, but rather to the administration of them. That point of order was made and sustained, and that was the only item of the bill, so far as I can find, which was disturbed on a point of order. Consequently, while I do not care to enter into this part of the controversy, it does seem to me that it is a rather far-fetched statement that this bill has been obstructed in years before by the intervention of points of order which were made when the fact is they were rather merely reserved and were later withdrawn. I simply want to make that statement for the Record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have some citations which I wish to put in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks by inserting the points in controversy in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. The only points of order raised on this bill will be found on page 1846, by Stafford; 1847, Connelly; 1886, to the proviso, by Stafford; 1887, by Stafford. All save the proviso were withdrawn.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in points of order made against the bill in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the Sixty-third Congress there was a rule brought in on the Diplomatic bill, but it was not pressed, and later on was withdrawn.

Mr. FLOOD. That was about a particular item, and did not cover the whole bill. It referred to the building of embassies and legations.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman recall that in the last Congress the Post Office appropriation bill was brought in with a lot of legislation in it, and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] got unanimous consent of the House that all of the provisions should be considered in order?

Mr. FESS. I remember that very distinctly. The only reason I rose to make this statement was to clarify the matter, and the statement that the Republicans attempted to obstruct the bill on the matter of specific appropriations, which I did not remember was the case, and which the Record clearly shows was not the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he is undertaking to make it appear that a Member of the House is acting in a disorderly sort of a way in raising points of order against an item in the bill that would go out by the decision of anybody in the chair?

Mr. FESS. I do not, for the simple reason that salaries for certain lines in the Diplomatic and Consular Service under the jurisdiction of this committee have not been permanent, and anyone could get up and make a point of order to item after item. I do not think that displays any particular prescient genius or any special patriotism.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody said that it did, but what I want to know is if it is to be considered bad form for anybody to raise a point of order against an item that is not authorized by law?

Mr. FESS. Certainly it is not bad form.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to vote for this rule, but I do not like this insinuation that Members are acting in bad form if they exercise their undoubted rights.

Mr. FESS. I think my friend, the ex-Speaker, will vindicate the action of the Rules Committee in bringing in a rule making these items in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to vote for the rule.

Mr. GARNER. Ought not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to say to the Foreign Affairs Committee and to the various committees of the House when they come in with appropriation bills and find them slaughtered, and more than one-half or a third of them stricken out on points of order, that they ought to take cognizance of that and go back to their committee room and draft legislation that will make these things in order in the future?

Mr. FESS. I would say to my friend that I am willing to report a rule to make this permanent, provided the Rules Committee cares to do that.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think that that would be good legislation.

Mr. FESS. We have done it before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I have any objection to this procedure, it is that the Committee on Rules appears to be reaching out and absorbing and usurping the authority of other committees in this House.

Mr. FESS. The Rules Committee simply reports to the House for its final decision. If its reports are not proper or objectionable, the House can reject the report. The purpose is to insure such legislation as is demanded to continue the operations of the Government. This particular rule is to continue the work of the State Department, and it was made necessary by the tactics employed to defeat the proposed legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make for bringing in this rule or any other rule that has been brought in by the committee during this Congress. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for a number of years, and my recollection is very distinct that for eight years prior to the beginning of this session of Congress we brought in rules here every few days to make items in order on appropriation bills. It is not necessary to recite them. The Record is full of them.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman that in a number of instances under Democratic administration rules have been brought in for the purpose of making items in order, but now the gentleman with his long experience on that committee ought to call the attention of those various committees to the fact,

when they ask for these rules, that they had a rule a year ago and have so far neglected to submit to the House legislation that would make the particular items in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Clearly then it is not the fault of the Committee on Rules that they are appealed to to enable the House to do what it wishes to do with respect to certain matters in appropriation bills.

Mr. GARNER. But the Committee on Rules has it within its power to give these various statutes consideration, and if you continue to give these committees the rules there will be no occasion for them to report a law to make these appropriations in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What I have said refers to items in appropriation bills, that in a way properly belong in such bills.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me that all this is leather and prunella, especially when the leader of the minority says that he is going to vote for the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] refers to some remarks that I made on a special rule making in order some legislation on the Agricultural appropriation bill. I would repeat every word that I said then, if it were necessary to do so. I am opposed to riders on appropriation bills, and I think the warning given at that time has been heeded. We have had few requests recently to make riders in order on appropriation bills. I adhere to every word that I said on that occasion, but when it is necessary to make in order items in an appropriation bill that would enable the particular branch of the Government to function that is being appropriated for, that raises an entirely different question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman stated it was a rider in the case to which I referred, but that was the case of a conference committee that exceeded its authority.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In putting a matter on an appropriation bill that had not been considered by either House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. They exceeded their authority.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was legislation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. When committees exceed their authority with respect to appropriating money for things, for which there is no law, is not that an excess of authority and is not that a rider?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no; it is not so regarded.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. The gentleman from Kansas was interrogated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as to whether or not this rule takes into consideration the Irish question. I presume he referred to the Mason resolution. I want to know if the chairman will permit an amendment to this rule now to take into consideration the Mason resolution, so that it may be brought before the membership of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The matter was not incorporated in the bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Rules does not take jurisdiction of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House having divided, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 311, nays 9, answered "present" 2, not voting 106, as follows:

YEAS—311.

Ackerman	Barkley	Box	Burdick
Almon	Bee	Brand	Burke
Anderson	Begg	Briggs	Burroughs
Andrews, Nebr.	Bell	Brinson	Butler
Anthony	Benson	Britten	Byrnes, S. C.
Ashbrook	Black	Brooks, Ill.	Byrnes, Tenn.
Aswell	Blackmon	Brooks, Pa.	Campbell, Kans.
Ayres	Bland, Ind.	Browne	Campbell, Pa.
Baer	Bland, Mo.	Browning	Cannon
Bankhead	Bland, Va.	Brumbaugh	Cantrill
Barbour	Bowers	Buchanan	Carss

Carter	Harrison	MacCrate	Schall
Chindblom	Hastings	MacGregor	Shreve
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	Madden	Siegel
Clark, Mo.	Hays	Magee	Sims
Classon	Heflin	Maher	Sinclair
Coady	Hernandez	Major	Sinnott
Cole	Hersey	Mansfield	Sisson
Collier	Hersman	Mapes	Slomp
Connally	Hickey	Mays	Small
Crago	Hicks	Mead	Smith, Idaho
Crisp	Hill	Merritt	Smith, Ill.
Crowther	Hoch	Michener	Smith, Mich.
Cullen	Hoey	Miller	Smithwick
Currie, Mich.	Holland	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Curry, Calif.	Huddleston	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Dale	Hudspeth	Mondell	Stephens, Ohio
Dallinger	Hulings	Montague	Stevenson
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Stinnes
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Strong, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Humphreys	Moore, Ind.	Strong, Pa.
Dempsey	Husted	Morgan	Summers, Wash.
Denison	Igoe	Mott	Summers, Tex.
Dent	Ireland	Murphy	Sweet
Dickinson, Mo.	Jacoway	Nelson, Mo.	Swope
Dickinson, Iowa	James	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Doremus	Johnson, Miss.	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Tenn.
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor	Temple
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Thompson
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Oldfield	Tillman
Dunbar	Juni	Oliver	Tilson
Dupré	Kearns	Overstreet	Timberlake
Eagan	Keller	Padgett	Tincher
Echols	Kelly, Pa.	Paige	Tinkham
Elston	Kendall	Park	Towner
Emerson	Kiess	Parker	Treadway
Esch	King	Parrish	Upshaw
Evans, Mont.	Kinkaid	Pell	Vaile
Evans, Nebr.	Kitchin	Peters	Vare
Evans, Nev.	Klecza	Platt	Venable
Fairfield	Kraus	Porter	Vestal
Fess	Lampert	Pou	Vinson
Fisher	Langley	Purnell	Volgt
Flood	Lanham	Quin	Walsh
Focht	Lankford	Radcliffe	Walters
Fordney	Layton	Rainey, Ala.	Ward
Frear	Lazaro	Rainey, H. T.	Weaver
Freeman	Lea, Calif.	Raker	Webster
French	Lee, Ga.	Ramsey	Welling
Fuller, Ill.	Lehibach	Ramseyer	Welty
Fuller, Mass.	Little	Randall, Calif.	Wheeler
Gallagher	Loneragan	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Gallivan	Longworth	Rayburn	White, Me.
Ganly	Luce	Reavis	Williams
Garland	Lufkin	Reber	Wilson, Ill.
Garner	McAndrews	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ia.
Glynn	McArthur	Rhodes	Wilson, Pa.
Good	McClintic	Ricketts	Wingo
Goodwin, Ark.	McDuffie	Riddick	Winslow
Goodykoontz	McFadden	Robinson, N. C.	Wise
Green, Iowa	McGlennon	Robison, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Rodenberg	Wright
Griest	McKeown	Rogers	Yates
Hadley	McKiniry	Rose	Young, N. Dak.
Hardy, Colo.	McLane	Rubey	Young, Tex.
Hardy, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rucker	Zihlman
Harrell	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—9.

Bakka	Kincheloe	Saunders, Va.	Steagall
Blanton	Rainey, J. W.	Sherwood	Thomas
Gard			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Griffin Rouse

NOT VOTING—106.

Andrews, Md.	Fields	Kreider	Rowan
Bacharach	Foster	Larsen	Rowe
Benham	Gandy	Lasher	Sabath
Boies	Garrett	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	Luhning	Sanders, N. Y.
Caldwell	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Sanford
Candler	Goodall	McKinley	Scott
Caraway	Gould	McPherson	Scully
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Mann, Ill.	Sears
Casey	Graham, Ill.	Mann, S. C.	Sells
Christopherson	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Cleary	Hamill	Mason	Snell
Cooper	Hamilton	Moon	Snyder
Copley	Haugen	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Costello	Hayden	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Cramton	Houghton	Mudd	Stoll
Davey	Howard	Neely	Sullivan
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Newton, Minn.	Tague
Donovav	Jefferis	Nichols, S. C.	Volstead
Doolling	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan	Wason
Dunn	Jones, Tex.	O'Connell	Watkins
Dyer	Kahn	Olney	Watson
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Osborne	Whaley
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Phelan	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Kettner	Riordan	
Ferris	Knutson	Romjue	

So the rule was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. CARAWAY.



Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SEARS.  
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. O'CONNELL.  
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. TAGUE.  
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.  
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.  
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. DEWALT.  
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. FIELDS.  
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SABATH.  
 Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.  
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. KETTNER.  
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. SMITH of New York.  
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. OLNEY.  
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. MOON.  
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PHELAN.  
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. HAMILL.  
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. MARTIN.  
 Mr. LUHRING with Mr. DOOLING.  
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. CASEY.  
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. HAYDEN.  
 Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. GANDY.  
 Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.  
 Mr. MASON with Mr. JONES of Texas.  
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. GARRETT.  
 Mr. WOODS of Indiana with Mr. CANDLER.  
 Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. ROMJUE.  
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. DONOVAN.  
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. CLEARY.  
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. STOLL.  
 Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.  
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. EAGLE.  
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. STEELE.  
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. LARSEN.  
 Mr. WASON with Mr. HOWARD.  
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GOLDFEGLE.  
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.  
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DAVEY.  
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. CAREY.  
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. LINTHICUM.  
 Mr. SCOTT with Mr. SULLIVAN.  
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LESSEE.  
 Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. NEELY.  
 Mr. SNELL with Mr. ROWAN.  
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. SCULLY.  
 Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. WATKINS.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular bill, H. R. 11960.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11960, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee adjourned on Saturday night the committee was dividing on the item on line 24, page 6.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that we return to page 3, line 7, in order to insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to return is not necessary. The rule provides that it is in order to amend the bill at any place; so the thing to do would be to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rule adopted by the House, did it not make merely in order any provision in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the rule to the gentleman. It says:

*Resolved*, That during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, any section of the bill as reported, and, upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it shall be in order to insert in any part of the bill any provision reported as part of the bill and heretofore ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. In the first part, where it says "upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs," does not that require a motion to return to a particular section to insert? I submit a point of order that it does require a motion to return

to any particular section, and then the committee has a right to offer to insert.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is wrong and that his point of order is not well taken. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 3, line 7, after the figures "1916," insert: "Provided, That secretaries in the Diplomatic Service shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows: Secretaries of class 1, \$4,000 per annum; secretaries of class 2, \$3,625 per annum; secretaries of class 3, \$3,000 per annum; secretaries of class 4, \$2,500 per annum."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask my colleagues not to let us deceive ourselves about the status of the present situation before the House. Under the point of order which was held good by the Chair the amount of \$134,000 of annual increases for the employees mentioned in this paragraph, not authorized by any law in the world, was eliminated from the bill. Why, if this amendment offered by the chairman of this committee is passed, it just simply means this, that each and every year until changed there will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States this \$134,000 of increases annually in salaries.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. ROGERS. The point the gentleman makes will not be changed by my suggestion, but the fact is that there are 135 secretaries contemplated—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield for that. I do not yield at all for that kind of stuff, because it means this, and the gentleman knows it, that it is an increase of salaries of \$134,000 a year that is not authorized by any law on the statute books.

You talk about economy in one breath, the economy policy of the dominant party in this House, and then your dominant party in another breath wastes and unlawfully appropriates hundreds of thousands of dollars, a policy that means economy that is only lip deep. There was nearly \$650,000 stricken out of this bill on last Saturday on points of order, made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and myself, because there was no law sustaining them. Now, my friends on this side of the aisle have brought in a gag rule here to make each and every one of these items in order. You can not fool the people at all. You can not fool the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee [Mr. GOOD], because he really has a sure enough case of economy on him, like I have.

And he is sincere in wanting to save the people money. But you will not stand by him. You are going to put back into this bill \$650,000 which is to be taken out of the Treasury each year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I could not refuse to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. What was the vote on the adoption of the rule? I was out of the Chamber at the time.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there were just a few that would stand by their own judgment and vote against that rule. I admit it. But I can tell the gentleman that there was one who voted against it, because I voted against it.

Mr. CANNON. Somebody tells me that were nine who did not want the rule, but the House was unanimous outside of that.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; under the party whip on that side and under the party whip on this side they were almost unanimous. But I am one of those who, as the gentleman knows, does not respond to the party whip unless it is on a question of party policy decided by caucus. When it is on a question of needlessly taking money out of the Treasury and wasting it, there is no party whip in the world that will whip me into line.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Hooray!

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; you can "hooray," and when the people find out that you voted to take \$650,000 out of the Treasury for the next year and needlessly waste it, a part of which is to educate young fellows in China and Turkey and Japan and let them come back here and sell the education they received from the Treasury of the United States to commercial institutions, your people will say "hooray," too, when you ask them to send you back to office. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in a sincere desire to economize. I am one of the Democrats who will stand shoulder to shoulder with him and help him keep people's fingers out of the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I know that there are three economists in this House—one the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and one the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and myself. [Laughter.] I want to suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that here is one of the items where he can help me and Mr. BLANTON save some money to the Government. I am really opposed to these increased salaries for the secretaries, and I am sincere in it—

Mr. GOOD. Mostly [laughter]—

Mr. KITCHIN. And am opposed to this amendment. If you defeat this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then the salaries of the secretaries remain just as they have been since 1915, according to the present law. During the war we did not increase these salaries. In 1916 we did not increase their salaries, and in 1917, 1918, and 1919 we did not increase the salaries. Even for this current fiscal year we did not increase the salaries of the secretaries. But now this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania increases the secretaries' salaries \$1,000 each, or a total increase of \$130,000. This is a new increase, never carried before in any act.

Now, we ought not to do that. I want you, gentlemen of the House, every one of you here who is going to vote on this question, to know that this increase of a thousand dollars to each secretary is not because the cost of living has increased. It is not to take care of the advancing cost of living. It has never been intimated by the Secretary of State that that is the reason why he wanted these salaries increased, because in the post-allowance fund of \$600,000 in the bill the increased cost of living is met. That fund has been used to increase the salaries, in addition to the bonus, to these secretaries, to meet the increasing cost of living. That is one of the purposes of this post-allowance fund of \$600,000 which is in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. May not the increase be provided for in anticipation of the raising of the standard of living on account of the League of Nations going into effect?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it may be, but I should not think so. But if so, you provide for that. You provide this \$600,000 post fund for that, and the chairman will tell you that that is true. So that, gentlemen, this increase now at this late date is not to enable the salaries of these secretaries to keep pace with the high cost of living.

The only reason in the world which the Secretary of State gives is to enable these secretaries of the ambassadors to go into good society, into "tango" and "kow-tow" society. [Laughter.] He says here in the report:

As the lieutenants of the ambassadors and ministers, the secretaries must be able to mingle with all classes of people and associate upon a plane of equality with the members of the highest social and official circles of the capitals in which they are located.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is not that caused by the fact that the social standard was set so high by the members of the peace commission and the social dignitaries that went to Paris? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. That is possible; it is very possible that the committee has anticipated that, and taken care of it. But Mr. Lansing does not ask for it, except to permit these secretaries to meet and mingle socially with the kings and queens and monarchs, the princes and princesses, and the lords and ladies of Europe and have them tango and kow-tow around with royalty; not to perform their duties in the office. [Laughter.] It may be that that is where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] gets the idea in his head, which he expressed on Saturday, that the American ambassadors are really figureheads; that they do not do anything except do the society act, and the secretaries have been doing the work. Now, the Secretary of State wants the secretaries to do the "society act" and let the ambassadors do the work. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. You can call this increase of salaries for secretaries a tango increase. You can vote for it if you want to. But you can save \$130,000 in that item, that has not been carried before, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] ought, in good conscience, to help defeat the amendment

of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If it were to keep pace with the increased cost of living we would all vote for it. But they not only get the bonus, but this \$600,000 fund enables the Secretary of State to increase salaries, so as to provide for the increased cost of living. That is put in there for that purpose.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think the secretary of a legation or an embassy should receive a salary of only \$1,500 a year?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know about that. If it was all that he needed in 1915, when we increased the salary to that figure, then it is enough now. You all voted for \$1,500 then. That is what is paid to the little fellows—the little secretaries. Some of them get \$3,000. If it was enough in 1915, when Congress considered the question of increase of their salaries, it is all they need now. If it was all they needed in 1916, it is all they need now. If it was all they needed in 1917 and 1918 and 1919, while the war was going on, it is all they need now. What got this tango-society idea into the head of the Secretary of State?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The Secretary of State belongs to the gentleman's party. He is closer to the Secretary of State than I am.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the reason the committee gives. Does the gentleman really believe a \$1,500 clerk increased up to \$2,500 will be enabled to circle on an equality with kings and queens and lords and ladies—to make a social hit in the royal society?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want an answer to that question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Will it enable him to do it?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to say to the gentleman that I think a man who is competent to hold a position as secretary of legation or secretary of embassy can not fulfill any of the functions of the position on a salary of \$1,500 a year.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is that one of the functions of this \$1,500 clerk or secretary, to go in this high diplomatic and royal society?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am not saying anything about his going into society. An American secretary of legation ought to receive more than \$1,500 a year.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Secretary of State puts it on that ground, and that alone. Most of the secretaries receive in salary, bonuses, and so forth, two or three and in some instances nearly four times as much.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But he ought to be entitled to live like an American citizen.

Mr. KITCHIN. We give them that bonus, and in the \$600,000 fund all the increased cost of living is provided for. Now, I want the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to help me save this \$130,000. It is one of the items on which he can well afford to join hands with me, and I hope he will.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say to the gentleman who has just been questioning you that when the State Department asked for the enactment of a law in 1915 he fixed this salary at \$1,500.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. In the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for 1918 did not the gentleman from Virginia recommend an increase in these salaries?

Mr. FLOOD. We did.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Congress refused to grant it; and that is what Congress ought to do right now.

Mr. PORTER. Did not the gentleman from Virginia also ask an increase of these salaries for the current year?

Mr. KITCHIN. And Congress refused to grant it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 42, noes 19.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to return to page 3, line 16, and insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, insert the following paragraphs:  
 "Chinese assistant secretary of legation to China, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.  
 "Japanese assistant secretary of embassy to Japan, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.  
 "Turkish assistant secretary of embassy to Turkey, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000."



The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 40, noes 2.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the RECORD, I call attention of the Chair to the fact that on page 3, line 12, the words and figures "in all, \$418,375," did not go out on the point of order Saturday, although the RECORD indicates that they did. Therefore the enrolling clerk should make sure that those words and figures appear in the bill when enrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that lines 16 to 20, on page 3 of the bill, were not stricken out on the point of order, and the offering of the first part of the amendment appears to be superfluous. No point of order was made against those lines so far as the Chair knows. Lines 21, 22, and 23, on page 3, went out on a point of order, but lines 16 to 20, inclusive, did not.

Mr. ROGERS. If the Chair will turn to page 2016 of the RECORD of Saturday, he will find the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

"Japanese assistant secretary of embassy to Japan, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.

"Turkish assistant secretary of embassy to Turkey, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no law providing for this assistant secretary.

There are three paragraphs, beginning with line 16 and ending with line 23, each of which deals with the appropriations for assistant secretaries. And while it is not entirely clear that the point of order of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] relates to the first or even to the second, it seemed to the chairman of the committee [Mr. PORTER] and myself when we went over it this morning that it was sufficiently in doubt so that the safest way was to offer the amendment which the gentleman did offer.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts the Chair will state that the point of order was raised against the last paragraph, lines 21 to 23, inclusive, and did not include the paragraphs in line 16 to 20. Those two paragraphs remain in the bill. The only ones that were stricken out were the ones embraced in lines 21 to 23; so that it will be in order for the gentleman to ask to vacate the action taken on his amendment.

Mr. PORTER. I ask unanimous consent that the action of the committee be corrected so as to leave the bill as it stood when introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to restore lines 21 to 23, inclusive, on page 3 instead of covering the lines from 16 to 23 on that page. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

For the employment of necessary clerks at the embassies and legations, who, whenever hereafter appointed, shall be citizens of the United States, \$438,000; and so far as practicable shall be appointed under civil service rules and regulations.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to keep the RECORD straight as we go along. This item of \$438,000 was eliminated from the bill last Saturday on a point of order, sustained by a Chairman from the majority side of this House, who held that there was absolutely no law whatever authorizing the appropriation; that the proposal of the committee to take \$438,000 out of the Treasury was a proposal not authorized by law. It was against the law of the land, and wholly unauthorized. The Republican Chairman of the committee, on a Democratic point of order, held that this \$438,000 was unauthorized, and it went out of the bill. Now the committee, under this steam-roller gag rule, has brought it back and put it into the bill. And this \$438,000 of the people's money will be spent and wasted.

Let me get into the RECORD where it leads us. Under the amendment recently offered by the chairman and adopted by a few Members here—about thirty-odd to 19—it has already provided for secretaries at \$4,000 per annum, assistant secretaries at \$3,625 per annum, second assistant secretaries at \$3,000 per annum, third assistant secretaries at \$2,500 per annum, making a total appropriation of \$418,375; and in addition to all these secretaries, assistant secretaries, and second and third assistant secretaries, amounting to \$418,375, the committee

comes in now and wants to appropriate this sum of \$438,000 for extra clerks for the various embassies in foreign countries. Can you, under such circumstances as this, with this kind of a record facing you, put down in black and white, from which you can not escape—can you go to your constituencies on the hustings in the next few months and tell them that you tried to economize and save money for the Government of the United States? Will they not laugh at you when you make such a claim as that? You will have a devilish hard time in making them believe it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Our constituencies are not from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, so far as the constituencies are concerned, ours in Texas can see right through any camouflage. The people of Texas can look through the camouflage of the facts in any case; and when you employ a big bunch of secretaries at \$4,000, assistant secretaries at \$3,625, second assistant secretaries at \$3,000, and third assistant secretaries at \$2,500, and so on down, making a total of \$418,375, you can not make them believe that it is necessary to appropriate an additional sum of \$438,000 annually for additional clerks.

Now, I am not going to take up any more time, because I can not change the action of the committee, operating under Republican bull-whip, steam-roller rule, but I leave the question right there, having gotten the RECORD straight.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment in the interest of the economy program of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Strike out the figures "\$438,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming is not here again. I understood him to say in his speech this morning that there were some items in here that he thought ought to be cut down, and I give him notice right here and now that if he does not stay here and help me cut down these items which are absolutely useless, pure extravagances and nothing else, I am going home and let the committee revel in its extravagance. [Laughter.]

I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming, who is not here and will not stay here when these outrageous items of extravagance are considered, that in 1917 the appropriation for that item amounted to only \$100,000.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the appropriation for 1918 was \$677,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but that was while we were in the war. We are out of the war, and we ought to get back to the prewar appropriations as nearly as possible. Now, I have offered an amendment which will allow \$300,000 and enable the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to save \$138,000 for "his economy program."

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the appropriation for the fiscal year ending 1920, passed three months after the signing of the armistice, amounted to \$688,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I tell the gentleman I am aware of that, but that was just after the armistice, when we were winding up affairs and did not know what was going to be done. We know now what is to be done—what has been done. The treaty of peace has been made and the League of Nations established, and why we should appropriate more than we appropriated in 1916 and 1917—during the war—I can not understand. If my amendment is adopted it will still leave an appropriation three times as much as they had in 1917 and enable us to save \$138,000.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the present Secretary of State recommended that this amount be fixed at \$688,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. And that we cut it to \$438,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and I tell the gentleman that the Secretary of State is a very fine, able, distinguished gentleman, a fine diplomat and all that, and makes a fine Secretary of State—no better; but he has this "tango," "royal" society idea about the clerks and secretaries. He wants to put these American clerks in society, and he asks this thing for that purpose, and no other. In my judgment, it is better to keep our secretaries and clerks out of that kowtowing society and let them sit in their offices

and do business. You know that \$2,000 or \$2,500 or \$3,000 is not going to enable one of our clerks to go into that "hifalutin' society." Why, what would one of the \$2,000 clerks do when the king and queen gave one of their functions—where are they going to be seated at the table?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to know about this now. Take these \$2,500 clerks, that you want to get into society over there. When the king and queen have one of their big international functions what is going to be the precedent of these clerks? Do they come in on an equality with the ambassadors and the ministers; come in arm and arm with them? [Laughter.] Will they take the queen in and sit by her side, or to the right or to the left of the queen or the king? [Laughter.] Will the secretaries come in after the ambassadors and sit by their side? Where do the clerks come—after the secretaries or before the secretaries? When the lords and ladies give these functions, are the clerks going to sit by them? I do not think that you have it large enough, if you want to get them into "society."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that a large number of these clerks are stenographers and typists?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but just think about a stenographer going into "royal society"! Think of the insult that this committee and the Secretary of State and the Congress is going to offer to the queens and kings and the princes and the princesses and the lords and the ladies of Europe by shoving a stenographer into their society! [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, I just can not stand for it, and why Mr. MONDELL is going to stand for it I do not know. Do you suppose that he is going to stand for this tango foolishness? I do not see, to save my life, when I am giving him an opportunity to have somebody stand with him why he is not here. Mr. BLANTON and myself will certainly stand with him on this matter. [Laughter.] We will stand by him and save \$138,000, and the appropriation will still be three times as large as it was in 1917.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I yield to both the gentlemen.

Mr. TEMPLE. The speech of the gentleman from South Carolina—

Mr. BLANTON. North Carolina.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from North Carolina. The speech of the gentleman from North Carolina is a very good Primrose and West speech, and it reminds me very much of the famous inquiry of Huckleberry Finn—"How much do a king git?"

Mr. KITCHIN. Let the gentleman just tell me now. Are you really voting for this thing in order to give a stenographer a higher standing in royal society? That is what the Secretary of State is asking. Is that why the gentleman from Pennsylvania votes for this?

Mr. TEMPLE. That is absolutely not what the Secretary of State asks for, and that is not why I am going to vote for it. This is a matter of sober business, not a minstrel end-man affair.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman vote for it on the ground put by the Secretary of State?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not on the ground put by the Secretary of State as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, as stated by him—

As lieutenants of the ambassadors and ministers, the secretaries must be able to mingle with all classes of people and associate upon a plane of equality—

Mr. TEMPLE. Does the gentleman know the difference between a secretary and a clerk?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes—

with the members of the highest social and official circles of the capitals at which they are stationed.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Secretary of State put it on the ground that I stated and I want to say—

Mr. TEMPLE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that what the gentleman read refers to secretaries.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am talking about secretaries' clerks.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman has been talking about clerks.

Mr. KITCHIN. I asked the gentleman if he voted for the increase in the secretaries' salaries a while ago upon the ground stated by the Secretary of State.

Mr. TEMPLE. The point under discussion now is the appropriation for the salaries of clerks to embassies, and not for secretaries.

Mr. KITCHIN. I know, and I am saving you \$138,000. I do not blame the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] for being in favor of these clerks going into this high society, because he has been one of them—I mean that he has gone into this "society" in his visits to London and Paris and other parts of Europe, and he knows what it is—and of course he wants all Americans in office over there, whether they are stenographers or clerks or janitors, to get into it and experience its emotions and sensations.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I want to say that I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion at most times, and it seems to me that the Secretary of State's department is a department that should not be disposed of in the spirit of levity.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not a bit. I am trying to show you gentlemen how ridiculous this is.

Mr. BEGG. Is the Secretary's word any good? The Secretary of State said—

Mr. KITCHIN. The committee evidently did not think his word was very good, because in two dozen places they have cut him down in the aggregate \$3,000,000.

Mr. BEGG. The Secretary of State testified before this committee that if he did not get increases for his clerks he would lose the clerks; that they were going into other avenues of business.

Mr. KITCHIN. But my amendment will still give three times as much as they had in 1917.

Mr. BEGG. He testified that even with what we are allowing him it would be questionable whether he would hold these people, but, as far as I am concerned, I will go with the gentleman as far as he wishes in crippling the Secretary of State.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, I do not want to cripple him.

Mr. BEGG. But I do think, in a spirit of fairness to our country and fairness to our Nation's business and reputation and honor, that we either ought to fire the Secretary of State or take his word when he soberly and honestly comes before the committee and gives it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You have repudiated his word to the extent of \$3,700,000.

Mr. BEGG. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The Secretary of State's department admitted they could possibly get along without that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, the economy in this bill is because of the Secretary and not because of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to return to page 4, line 22, to insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 4, line 22, to page 6, line 24, inclusive, insert the following.

The Clerk proceeded to read the balance of the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Inasmuch as the rule makes any section of the bill in order, I submit to the Chair, on a point of order, that it is improper for the committee, by amendment, to offer more than one section at a time, because the House has a right to vote on these sections separately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to agree with the gentleman from Texas. The Chair assumes that while one paragraph is considered at a time, it would not be in order to offer an amendment to the whole bill. If the gentleman will offer—

Mr. BLANTON. I want to beg the pardon of the Rules Committee if I am guilty of committing lese majeste in making a point of order now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 22, insert:

"For 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation



and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the legation or consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. On page 4, line 22, after the word "For," strike out "ten" and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment offered by the committee: Page 4, line 22, after the word "For," strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues—the few who happen to be present in the House at this time—to the fact that a little later on we are going to provide, according to the Republican program, for 6 student interpreters to Japan. Why should we have 10 student interpreters to China, drawing \$1,500 a year, for whom we pay \$200 apiece tuition, and for whom we pay \$600 for quarters, and have only 6 to Japan? If 6 student interpreters to Japan are sufficient, why should not 6 student interpreters to China be sufficient? I merely call it to the attention of my colleagues, who are sensible men and business men—at least some of them are; most of them are, I presume; all of them should be business men—why we should put in 10 for China and 6 only for Japan. If it is necessary for us to have American student interpreters going to school in China, drawing a salary of \$1,500, drawing \$200 apiece for tuition, and \$600 for quarters, why should we not have 10 for Japan? If the committee has been consistent in providing only 6 for Japan, then I am sure my amendment is good, seeking to reduce the number to China from 10 to 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 8, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, insert:

"For six student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Japanese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in Japan so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 36, noes 1.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 21, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 24, insert:

"For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the language of Turkey and any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service as interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method

of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter to the embassy and consulates in Turkey so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how many of these students they have in Turkey now actually studying?

Mr. PORTER. What was the question?

Mr. LITTLE. How many of these 10 student interpreters have they actually?

Mr. PORTER. I think they have the full number, although I am not sure.

Mr. LITTLE. How many consulates have they in Turkey?

Mr. PORTER. I do not have the number handy, but I will give it to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, Turkey is a defunct empire. If there was a time when there was reason for having 10 students to learn its language and customs and familiarize themselves with its business, it has gone by. Turkey is divided into other countries de facto and soon will be de jure. There is no reason why we should involve ourselves in these useless expenses. The country should save this money, for the simple reason that Turkey is no longer Turkey, and there is no longer any demand like there was for these students. There never was any, anyway. There never was at any time any necessity for it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Not just now. I will yield in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LITTLE. At the very least, you ought to cut this down. I am going to ask the chairman if he would not agree to a motion to reduce this from 10 to 4?

Mr. PORTER. I would not care to do so except upon the recommendation of the Department of State. It is only a question of time when we will resume our relations with Turkey. These students in Turkey are absolutely necessary to the service.

Mr. LITTLE. Let me say right here that they are not. There is no business in Turkey to justify any such selection, and if the department is coming to the committee and telling us that we are going to resume relations with Turkey in the very near future there is hardly anybody here who would believe it. There is not any more Turkey, but we will resume relations with some part of Turkey at some time. The 10 student interpreters in China are very useful, but these in Turkey are of no value. Let us save a little money here. What is the use in making this appropriation? We are allowing the Department of State, which, it has developed, does not know much about it, to mislead us here.

The other day I made some suggestions as to certain idiosyncrasies which had been recommended by the department which were found to be mistakes, and it turned out that the thing was in worse shape than I thought, because when the discussion was over and the storm wound up it was ascertained that you did not have enough law to found practically any appropriation upon it at all, and you had to go and frame a rule and have it brought in here to support it. This committee is not to blame for that, however. The other side has done it for years, brought in such a bill, and it is not unnatural that both committees should follow the lead of the State Department. The committees are not to blame; but you are to be blamed if, having these mistakes pointed out to you, you still continue them. There is no one in the State Department who is competent to inform you about this. It is a fact that the reports of the State Department are often incorrect and inaccurate, so that you can not found items in a bill upon such reports. You should get what data you can together, and then do the best you can. Here is an admirable instance where a saving can be made. Here is a country that has gone out of business, where we formerly had 10 students, and we have the same number in China, a country of 400,000,000 people, almost, with 10 student interpreters. Can you not see at a glance that there is a mistake here?

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman from Kansas understand that these student interpreters are being educated in order to be of assistance to certain financial interests in this country in establishing industries in Turkey to compete with American factories?

Mr. LITTLE. I did not so understand it.

Mr. KING. We might as well understand what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "ten" and insert "four," on page 5, line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE to the amendment offered by the committee: Page 5, line 24, after the word "For," strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has already taken his time on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. I can wait for another amendment, then.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better proceed with the consideration of the bill, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what I am here for, to proceed with the consideration of the bill. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled to be heard on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman would have the right, under the rules of the House, to make a speech in advance, and then to make another speech after offering the motion. It could only be done under unanimous consent.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to be heard in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. It can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, well, I will get time later on.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I move to strike out "ten" and insert "six," to provide for 6 student interpreters instead of 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] has moved to strike out "ten" and insert "four."

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out "ten" and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out "ten" and insert "six."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], who has had wide experience in consular work and is the only man in the House who has had such personal experience, asked the chairman of this committee how many of these students we now have in Turkey. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee could not tell him. He did not know anything about it. He brings in a measure before the House to have a provision made law when he does not even know and he can not answer a pertinent question. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] asked another question. He asked the chairman of this committee whether or not it was going to be necessary to keep these students there, and how many interpreters we had at this time in Turkey.

The chairman said he could not tell it. He did not know. Now, the committee has brought in a bill here providing only 6 student interpreters to Japan, a great big country like Japan, a country whose language is hard to learn, and yet they have provided for a country like Turkey 10 student interpreters when we have only allowed 6 for Japan. Ah, the gentleman from Kansas touched the keynote Saturday when in discussing this matter he said the item in this bill was pure graft, and in a large measure it is. It is for the purpose of putting a bunch of pet favorites over there who want to take a trip to Japan, a trip to Turkey, or a trip to China, go to school, get \$1,500 a year, get \$200 for tuition and \$600 for quarters, and after getting the education come back here and sell it to the merchants of this country.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that these students have to sign an agreement to remain in the service for five years?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but what does that amount to, and what is the agreement worth? I have seen lady school-teachers in my State sign an agreement when entering a State normal school to learn how to teach, that after graduation they would teach so many years in the State, and then when they came out they would marry as soon as they graduated and not a day did they teach. How are you going to reach them? They merely say they will do it, but they do not do it. What comes after that? Nothing. The gentleman from Kansas was right when he said it was monkey business, but we can not expect anything else with the Republican steam-roller

power that is in the saddle ready to bleed the Treasury to death.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I make the point of order that that is an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this discussion about economy in this appropriation bill, making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, induces me to make an observation. I notice the bill takes up the various activities of the Department of State, which has to do with the foreign relations of the Government of the United States. It takes up separately each activity and makes an appropriation therefor. I understood the distinguished chairman of the committee to say that the committee in formulating the bill heard evidence from the Secretary of State and other sources, and then exercised such judgment as the committee was permitted to exercise in agreeing upon the items of the appropriation for these different activities.

I have observed also that in the discussion so far it has been taken up by paragraphs, each appropriation discussed, and amendments offered or otherwise. I am curious to know why that course was pursued with reference to this appropriation bill for the Diplomatic and Consular Service and not pursued with reference to the river and harbor bill. Why, if the steering committee desired to economize, did they not pursue the same policy in this bill that they did with the river and harbor bill? Why did not they adopt the same plan that they did with the river and harbor bill?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will not make any progress by that method.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. All I want is to save time.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will not save time in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. SMALL. I am discussing this bill, Mr. Chairman. The committee has brought in items aggregating upwards of \$8,000,000. I assume that that was the aggregate of these several appropriations for the various activities of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. Why did not the steering committee say that \$8,000,000 is too much and direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make it, say, \$6,000,000? They could have saved \$2,000,000 in that way.

Why not make it \$4,000,000? Would the steering committee reply that \$4,000,000, when divided up among the activities of the Diplomatic and Consular Service, would not meet the needs of the service or that it could not be intelligently and wisely allocated? I might answer that the suggestion of \$12,000,000 for the river and harbor bill was made without rhyme or reason; it had no application to any of the estimates considered by the committee. It had no reference to the various activities for the improvement and maintenance of the rivers and harbors of the country as set forth in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers. Why did not you make this appropriation \$6,000,000, and save over \$2,000,000, just like you saved it in the river and harbor bill?

Now, gentlemen, I am going to continue to ask this question about the various appropriation bills until Members of the House shall understand the flagrant injustice that has been done to that great activity of the Government, the maintenance and improvement of our rivers and harbors, so closely associated with the prosperity of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more. I want to keep him straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks that the time of his colleague be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I understand, the steering committee intended to make this a lump sum and let the Secretary of State spend it as he saw fit.

Mr. SMALL. In this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I understand that was the program.



Mr. SMALL. I am shocked.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman need not be shocked; that might be the wise thing to do. But they found that the Secretary of State was liable to spend all of it on these secretaries, janitors, and stenographers in getting them into real society.

Mr. SMALL. Could not the Secretary of State allot the appropriations under existing law as wisely as the Chief of Engineers could allot it under the river and harbor bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. The committee did not object so much to that, but they did not want the Secretary of State to pay it all to the secretaries and stenographers and janitors in order to get them into society. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. [Laughter.]

I have received a copy of resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Madison, Ind., on January 23, 1920, which, by leave of the House, I append to my remarks:

Whereas the action of the House of Representatives this week in curtailing 70 per cent the usual annual appropriations for river and harbor improvements must inevitably delay the completion of projects important in our national transportation system: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Commercial Club of Madison, Ind., That we view with profound regret what we must consider a backward and most unfortunate step;*

That we cite the many years which have elapsed since the construction of the Davis Island Dam, the first upon the Ohio River, an average man's lifetime, and the system still so incomplete as to be comparatively useless.

We cite the fact that 10 years ago, in 1910, Congress passed a resolution affirming its purpose to complete the Ohio River project by 1920. Under the present policy and appropriations it will require at least six more years, and 1920 is here.

We regard as deceptive and illusory the plausible proposition that the unexpended balances in the Treasury are sufficient for all Ohio River work possible this fiscal year.

We contend the customary appropriation of \$5,000,000 for new work upon the Ohio River should have been made in order that advantage might be taken of low water, if we have it, or other favorable conditions; that the construction of many locks and dams might be carried on simultaneously; and we urge that this annual appropriation for new locks and dams upon the Ohio River be yet made and be subject to the call of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

We protest against the new theory advanced by the honorable chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that appropriations should only be made to take care of existing commerce. We assert a vast commerce has been driven from the Ohio River by lack of a channel of sufficient depth and the piratical rate cutting and other hostile and illegal practices of railroad corporations; that this commerce will be immediately restored by the completion of the system of locks and dams and the enactment of proper protective legislation; that to propose to wait until the commerce restores itself unaided is fallacious and bears the appearance of being suggested in bad faith or by want of thought.

We, therefore, as representatives of the commercial and manufacturing interests of the city of Madison, and the agricultural interests of this section of the Ohio Valley, respectfully petition and urge upon the House of Representatives the reconsideration of their action in respect to the river and harbor appropriation bill, H. R. 11892, and do hereby earnestly request that it be amended and passed in the form recommended by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the benefit and advantage of the entire country.

*Resolved, That we especially call upon our representative in Congress, Hon. JOHN S. BENHAM, to actively and vigorously sustain the views we have presented, and also urge the same effectiveness upon the part of our United States Senators from Indiana, Hon. HARRY S. NEW and Hon. JAMES E. WATSON.*

*Resolved, That our secretary is hereby instructed to send copies of these resolutions to Hon. CHARLES A. KENNEDY, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, House of Representatives; Hon. JOHN S. BENHAM, Member of Congress; and Senators HARRY S. NEW and JAMES E. WATSON.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last half of the section. On Saturday I made a motion to change Luxemburg over to Belgium, where it ought to be and was promptly met with a point of order that it was not within the law. It gradually developed that most of the rest of the bill was in the same situation, so that no time was made in that way. Just now I have made a motion to reduce 10 interpreter students to 6, and because the State Department so recommended and without any knowledge of the facts the committee insists upon putting in 10. I have just heard an inquiry from one of the committee in respect to the language spoken over there. In the first place, most of the people in the old Turkish Empire speak Arabic. All of the people who live in Egypt and about Damascus and Jerusalem, and in Mesopotamia, and that country over there, speak Arabic. In Kurdistan, they speak Kurdish. In Armenia, they speak Armenian. The only place where many of the people of the old empire speak Turkish is in Anatolia, a northwestern Province of Asia Minor, and in Turkey

in Europe. A very small percentage of this territory was occupied by people who spoke Turkish. Practically all of the trade was done with people who speak Arabic.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. In a moment. If you will turn to the bill itself, you will see that it says to teach the people to speak Turkish and the other language in the Empire. That is because the man who originally drew that item knew that Turkish was a very minor language in that country. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. I was merely going to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that these student interpreters are to speak not only Turkish but any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service at the embassies and consulates in Turkey.

Mr. LITTLE. But I beat you to it. Just now I gave that information.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman is assuming that the committee did not know when that language was incorporated in the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Evidently some of the committee did not know it, because one of them was trying to tell us why they should be taught Turkish. A very small part of those interpreters would be taught Turkish, as I have suggested to the gentleman. Arabic would be the most useful language. They do not teach Arabic in Constantinople, but it is taught at Cairo and at the American colleges at Beirut and Assiut. Those people should be educated at Assiut and Beirut. There is no excuse in the world for educating 10 interpreters at Constantinople. There is no business through the country that warrants it or makes it necessary. At Roberts College are hundreds of young men, Turks, learning English.

There are scores on scores of American missionaries and students in American colleges there who speak English and Arabic and Turkish. There is, as I said, a college at Constantinople where they teach young Turks English. There are no such high-class institutions in Japan and China, maintained for the purpose of doing that. You do not any more need 10 student interpreters or 1 in Turkey than you need an extra thumb on one of your hands. The committee has just done what the State Department has told them, and has slapped it in. I want to support the committee. They have evidently saved a great deal of money. You can tell that is so by the fuss that is made by the Democrats on the other side of the aisle. You men have been doing very good work from the way they act. A man never groans unless he is hurt, and they would not be howling around here about saving money if you had not done so. But that has nothing to do with the hiring of 10 interpreters for Turkey. Roberts College and the college at Beirut and at Assiut teach men both Arabic and Turkish. There are thousands of young men who are seeking to go to these colleges to learn English, and the committee should not permit the department to waste this \$15,000 when so many young men are studying these languages there in the mission schools. Let us be reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have not any special knowledge to warrant me in giving an opinion on the proposition which has been discussed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. I know that he has special knowledge of that proposition. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to give expression before this committee rises to my great satisfaction on the bill which has been presented by the committee. I think they have had in mind the main idea. It consists of two propositions. In the first place, a condition that requires the strengthening of our Diplomatic Service, and a condition that requires that more than ever before, in order that we may be intelligently and adequately represented in the countries to which we will be required to send our representatives, we must enlarge and strengthen the present service. There never was a time in the history of the country when we needed to strengthen our Diplomatic and Consular Service more than at the present. It seems to me that there can not be a man on the floor of this House but must recognize that fact. I think the committee has done well under the circumstances, and within the limits existing, to see to it that the present shall not be a period of retrogression, and that we should generally strengthen the service for the time when we will have to very materially enlarge it. Within a very short time, in order to decently, not to say adequately, represent this country, we will be compelled to enlarge our Diplomatic and Consular Service. I am very glad, indeed, that the committee has done what it could under the conditions that exist with regard to our financial situation and the condition of the Treasury in presenting a bill here which, in my

judgment, ought to receive the support of every member of the committee and of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 11, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, after line 19, insert:

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 22, insert:

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Turkey, \$600."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman animadverted to the necessity of interpreters for the future, which I recognize as much as anybody. I want to call attention to an incident which may illustrate to you the absolute fallacy of the idea of expending taxpayers' money to learn Arabic and Turkish. We have a school at Assiut to teach young men the Arabic and the English languages. At Beirut we have a similar school. In the two there have been thousands of young men. They go to those schools and they learn the English language, and there are hundreds of people in that Empire who speak the English language just as well as you and I do. This section is for the purpose of educating somebody and giving him a lift. The opportunity is admirably given at Assiut, Beirut, and elsewhere.

The thing I had in mind, which may illustrate to you the absurdity of it, is a little incident that occurred to me in Montreal a few years ago when I was going down to the depot. I saw a young man who had a book in his hand, with a paper cover on it, that was printed in Arabic. It made me think of the old times. Of course, I know not so many words of Arabic, but I slipped my arm about him as I went along and I said, "Nahar ac zied, effendi." He was pleased to hear somebody speak his mother tongue. I do not know enough Arabic to talk very long, and I exhausted all the little that I had, and then I went to talking the English language, when I found that he had been at Beirut and spoke as good English as I did. And I found that the book he was reading was one of Shakespeare's plays that had been translated into Arabic.

I feel that we are being worked by somebody down in the department who does not know anything about it. This House ought to have more respect for itself. You do not say a word when your President talks about Poland and Czechoslovakia and recognizes them. Why do not you say something about these things? Where is the law that says you can not send a minister to Armenia or to Georgia, when he is sending commissioners to Budapest and Riga? I think the commissioner there gets 75 per cent of a minister's pay. The President does not ask you to do it; he goes ahead and does it. Why do you not take upon yourselves a little responsibility and do what is right about such a little thing as this?

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman thinks that we should have embassies and legations in these nations, why does he not introduce a bill to that effect?

Mr. LITTLE. If I thought I would get any more consideration for it than I got for the resolution, or amendment, which I introduced here yesterday, I would do it.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman introduce a bill?

Mr. LITTLE. I will if you advise it.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman seems to be convinced of the wisdom of doing it.

Mr. LITTLE. As I said, if I do not get any higher welcome than I have so far with my suggestions, it would not be a wise thing to do it. But if the gentleman advises me to do it, I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas has spoken of the institutions to be found within the Turkish

Empire and in Egypt, a former dependency of the Turkish Empire. The committee knows, of course, of the institutions mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas. I am personally acquainted with a good many of the professors in the college at Assiut. In spite of the gentleman's acquaintance with conditions in the Turkish Empire he entirely misunderstands the purpose of this paragraph of the bill. He speaks of institutions where natives can learn to speak the English language. It is the purpose of this appropriation to make provision for the reverse of that. It is the purpose to teach the various languages used in Turkey to Americans who are to be employed in the embassies.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman knows that it is one of the requirements of those schools that they shall know Arabic before they begin teaching. You have a splendid array of missionaries in Turkey—

Mr. TEMPLE. You could never get one of them to leave the missionary work and accept the salary of interpreter.

Mr. LITTLE. I had one at Alexandria while I was there.

Mr. TEMPLE. But he continued his missionary work at the same time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield? In what language are the publications of the Turkish Empire printed?

Mr. TEMPLE. They are printed in more than one.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Are they printed in Turkish?

Mr. TEMPLE. In Turkish and other languages.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the provision which says:

For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States.

They are not Arabs and Turks who may be taught English but Americans who are to be employed in the embassies and consulates, and who must be American citizens, loyal to this country, worthy of being trusted with confidential business, and must be made familiar with the languages that are spoken in Turkey, including the Turkish, Arabic, and others.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman tell me how many Americans there are acting as students?

Mr. TEMPLE. I looked in the directory a moment ago and found, in spite of the disorganization of the service which necessarily followed the breaking off relations, there are still persons who are drawing salaries as provided in this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit, I would like to say that if the gentleman from Kansas in all of the years he spent in Turkey, and with his distinguished ability, was unable to learn the Turkish language, does it not only emphasize the necessity for providing some method for teaching American citizens the Turkish language in order that they may perform the necessary service?

Mr. TEMPLE. It seems to me it is necessary, if the diplomatic and consular work is to be carried on by Americans who are loyal to this country, to teach our own people these languages, and to begin when they are young enough to learn them.

Mr. LITTLE. That emphasizes the point I am making. There was not anyone in Egypt talking Turkish.

Mr. TEMPLE. But they teach some of the other languages used in that country and referred to in line 2, page 6.

Mr. LITTLE. They teach Arabic out there. The point is made clear by the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] did not say how many of those students there are on the record.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman knows very well that we have broken off diplomatic relations with Turkey, and that all of the diplomatic and consular officers were removed, and we are now looking after American interests under an informal arrangement by means of an American commission as distinguished from an embassy or legation, and are making only partial progress. I call the gentleman's attention to testimony which appears in the committee hearings, as follows:

The situation all over Europe is anomalous; and the action is not to be determined by any prewar principle of international law. In Turkey we have a high commissioner who is an admiral; we have a commissioner who was formerly American consul general, and we have several consular officers who do not function as consular officers, but are unofficial assistants to the high commissioner and the commissioner. It is very necessary that those officials be there as observers and workers in cooperation with the representatives of the allied Governments at those places, for the protection of legitimate American interests.

Outside of the State Department nobody knows, I presume, whether additional adjustments have been made within the last week or in the last 24 hours.

Mr. LITTLE. How many do you find in the record?

Mr. TEMPLE. The record is available to the gentleman. Now, these interpreters, American citizens, who learn the languages of the various parts of the Turkish Empire—



Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not catch the question that the gentleman from Kansas asked and what the gentleman's answer was.

Mr. TEMPLE. His question was how many student interpreters there are now. I say our whole Diplomatic and Consular Service has been withdrawn from Turkey and has not been restored. It is impossible to tell how much progress has been made from day to day in the reestablishment of this work through the American mission in the Turkish Empire.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There are no student interpreters needed in Turkey at the present time?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. There is one in Egypt and there are two in Japan and there are five in China and one in Siam.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Have we not passed upon the question as to whether or not we are to have these 10 interpreters?

Mr. TEMPLE. There is an amendment still pending. That is what is under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, did I not have an amendment pending before that was to be voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It was a motion in opposition to the amendment. The Chair will state that when the committee adjourned on Saturday the committee was dividing on the paragraph on line 24 of page 6. The question is on agreeing to that item.

The item was agreed to.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss of bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States courts for China, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$810,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the total sum appropriated by this paragraph, \$810,000, for the expenses of embassies, seems like a very large sum, but I have no doubt the committee went over it carefully, as they have done with respect to all the items in this bill, the framing of which I very much commend, and it is probably justified.

I listened with much interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], made when the rule was offered to-day, and with most of what he said I entirely agree. He seemed, however, to be somewhat concerned with reference to a matter that never has caused me any worry of late years. If I understood correctly the subject to which he was referring, I take it that he had in mind the salaries which are paid to our ambassadors and ministers. Complaint has been constantly made that they were not sufficient, and that by reason of that fact they had to be filled, as is sometimes stated—and I think the gentleman from Ohio himself so said—from the ranks of the idle rich.

Now, there was a time when it was highly important as to who should fill these ambassadorial posts. Years ago, before the Atlantic cables were established, communication took sometimes a month, and in the early days of the Republic sometimes two months. The ambassador had to conduct the international

affairs of our country entirely without any advice from Washington. At the present day, however, the cable is at his instant command, and he gets his directions every day, and sometimes every hour, from here. The principal thing that he does is to make speeches which are noncommittal in nature. He ought to be a very affable man, a very attractive man in personality, one who will get along with everybody, give no offense, and do but little that will commit his Government to anything whatever, except as he is instructed from Washington. For that reason I see no reason why these posts should not be filled by wealthy men. It is altogether different from the situation that would be presented if we undertook to fill the ranks of this Assembly or of the Senate solely with wealthy men, in which event the greater portion of our citizens would not be represented at all.

Mr. BAER. Does not the gentleman think that would be dangerous, in view of the advantages that these men would have in trade relations, which is very important? These men might be connected with large corporations, which would make it inexpedient for us to confine it simply to wealthy men. If you confine these appointments, with all the information that they obtain with regard to foreign trade, to men of wealth, it would be dangerous. I think we ought to pay our ambassadors enough to secure the services of efficient men. I think we should pay them even double, if necessary, so that they would have plenty on which to live in decency and would be respected by the people of foreign nations. I do not think this is the place to economize.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The consuls have more to do with trade relations than the ambassadors themselves. The positions of consuls ought not to be filled solely with the ranks of wealthy men. But the principal qualification of an ambassador is to appear well in high society, to handle himself in a creditable manner in the midst of the society in which he is presented. He should be, as I said, agreeable and affable to all, and very often a poor man might not be so well qualified in that respect. Moreover, he often is compelled to entertain in a very expensive manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A poor man, I say, might not be so well qualified to shine in that class of society as one who has spent all his life in their midst. Our ambassadors have distinguished themselves of late years, not so much by what they have done as by what they have not done. They have not got our Nation into any trouble. They have always expressed themselves in an agreeable way toward the nations to which they were accredited. They often distinguish themselves as after-dinner speakers. They promote friendly social relations and create mutual good feeling, and use their money in lavish entertainment. That is what they are principally for, at the present time. They control nothing of the important matters, and for that reason I think we might well use their wealth in this manner.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Do these foreign ambassadors have anything to do with the determining of the policy of this Government in foreign countries, such as the policy in Mexico?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They do not and ought not to, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Is there anything in the bill that compels a man to be rich or poor in order to be an ambassador?

Mr. ROGERS. It is what is not in the bill that has that effect.

Mr. BAER. If the ambassador does not get enough salary, unless he is rich, he can not live over there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is said that our ambassadors can not live in proper style on the sums that are appropriated for that purpose. Probably they can not if they make the display, and go through the pomp and ceremony that for ages has attached to their position. Many of us, like myself, consider all this as a legacy of folly inherited from the days when kings were considered divine and their representatives were expected by their gilded trappings and retinues of servants to exemplify the greatness and wealth of their sovereign lords. If some wealthy man wants to spend his money in this idle show, which, to my mind, is as senseless as a peacock's strut with his tail feathers extended, let him do it; but I am opposed to using the people's money for that purpose.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend this paragraph by inserting a comma after the word "expenses," in line 2, which the context clearly requires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "expenses," in line 2. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DOWELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 11606) for a bridge over the Wabash River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3451. An act authorizing and directing the United States Shipping Board to adjust and pay the claims of wooden-ship builders arising out of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

#### CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], in a much milder and more genteel fashion than that employed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] on last Saturday, seems to have sought to minimize the dignity and functions of our foreign ambassadors and ministers. Gentlemen who were in the Chamber on last Saturday will recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts, while the question of the appropriation for ambassadors to Russia, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary was under discussion, sought to characterize these gentlemen, not by name but by a sweeping charge, as mere figureheads, and later on in his discussion he referred to some of the United States ministers serving in recent years at least as having been "scum of the earth." Now, I take it that since we were then discussing the ambassadors at Petrograd, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary, the gentleman in employing the language "figureheads" must have referred to some of the gentlemen representing this country at those courts in the recent past.

I repudiate and denounce the proposition that an ambassador representing this country in a foreign capital should not possess large ability, and I also deny that those who have represented this country within the last few years have been lacking in those qualities. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] in using the word "figurehead" could have referred to Mr. Francis, of Missouri, who rose from a newsboy on the streets of St. Louis to be the governor of a great State, and who so acceptably and capably performed the duties of ambassador to Russia? I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts could have referred to Mr. Morgenthau, the distinguished gentleman who, though I understand he was born in a foreign land, rendered such patriotic service during the war? I wonder if he could have referred to Mr. Penfield, who served at Vienna? I wonder, if he had no reference to those gentlemen, if he included within his description Mr. Sharp, a former Member of this House, who at Paris during the troublous times of the war represented the interests of this Government so efficiently and so admirably as to meet the approval of the whole Nation? Or, if he did not refer to any of these gentlemen, perhaps he had in his mind that other representative of this Government, Mr. Brand Whitlock, who at Brussels during the time of the German invasion succored the needy and interceded for the helpless and held the one lone outpost of justice and of right amidst that savage storm?

I repudiate the doctrine as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that because of the cable it is not necessary for our representatives to be men of large ability and wide vision. It is very easy for one who has not the proper qualifications to involve this country in troubles with foreign powers. It is very easy to do that which he should not do or to fail to do that which he should do and thereby bring about a very critical state of affairs. Of course he should be in communication with Washington by cable, because all our ambassadors are representatives of the President of the United States, who under the Constitution is given the power to carry on the foreign affairs of this Government, and who is responsible for their discharge; but that fact does not necessarily imply that his agents or servants should not be men of large ability and wide experience, and I utterly denounce such a proposition.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The CHAIRMAN. Can not the gentleman address his remarks to the next paragraph?

Mr. LITTLE. I want to speak right now in answer to the gentleman from Texas.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] wisely suggested that the American ambassadors ought to be men of ability. That is true. It is singularly unfortunate that more talent is not called into that service. The reason is this: It has been heralded abroad for a long time that nobody except a rich man can afford to take one of these positions. That is done with the direct purpose of preventing men of ability from going after them. Both parties select for these positions men who have contributed to their campaign funds and who, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] suggested, have pleasing address and can get along without breaking the window panes, and who are sent over there in the hope that they will get through without getting us into trouble. For that reason there is no demand for these positions by men of real ability who have not independent means.

In the old days an ambassador was the personal representative of his king, and when he went to another capital he represented his king and was entitled to the same courtesy and attention and ceremonies that his king would be because he was the king's personal representative. So, it was a great thing to be an ambassador. All that remains of that now is the old custom of being ceremonious. It is the one place on earth where fine clothes are the principal distinguishing characteristic of the function. As has been suggested here, the business is largely done from the capitals of the respective countries, and not through the ambassador. The wiser and better he is, the better it is for his country, but if we could get rid of the idea that nobody except a rich man can go, we would have some ability in these positions, and we would not be told that they were such figureheads. There is not much to it. Of course, the consular office is the place where the principal business is done. Practically all of any importance is done through the consul, and the committee can not go too far in backing up the Consular Service, and in sending American citizens with strong arms and strong minds to extend our business relations abroad, and they can not go too far. I wish we could get away from the ideas of these ceremonies and fancy clothes, and these idle men. I said to an ambassador once, "What do you do at home?" He said, "I try as hard as I can to do nothing." He had so much money that he did not have to work, and he did not want to work. The idea apparently is to select an ambassador who has got so much money that he does not have to work at home, and send him abroad. That ought to be stopped.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman understands that when we send an ambassador to a foreign country he must follow their customs. Is not that true?

Mr. LITTLE. No. Why should he?

Mr. LAZARO. He must attend the functions to which he is invited. He must become friendly.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. He has got to have a set of evening clothes and a white shirt.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman must know that it costs money to do that.

Mr. LITTLE. Benjamin Franklin did not have money, and I have never heard that he made a failure. Who are the representatives of France, England, and Italy here? What difference does it make whether they go to parties or not? How does that assist them in doing the business of their countries? An ambassador is sent to attend to certain duties, and it does not make any difference whether he has a dress suit or not. That does not assist him to carry out the business of his Government. If it does we have a mighty cheap set of skates down there, and the same everywhere else. It is not the man who is successful in society that makes the best ambassador; it is the man of ability and good sense, whether he goes to a party or not.

Mr. LAZARO. I do not mean that it is the man who does society the best, but at the same time if an ambassador is invited to functions he must be courteous and accept.

Mr. LITTLE. A college professor as poor as skim milk may be courteous and a man of good sense. There are several Members of Congress who have not enough money to sustain them through life, but who would make good ministers. Wealth is not necessary to an ambassadorship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### STEAM LAUNCH FOR EMBASSY AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Hiring of steam launch for use of embassy at Constantinople, \$1,800.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question for information. I move to strike out the last word. Here is \$1,800 for a steam launch over in Constantinople. Why do you want to have a launch when you have nobody to ride in it?

Mr. PORTER. The money will not be used unless there is somebody there to use it. It might be more correct to say that



the American Government has a representative in Constantinople who may have use for the launch.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to say, while I have the five minutes, that I overlooked these items on page 7, and thought that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was going to take care of that proposition, and he would cut down the estimates about \$200,000, and possibly have offered an amendment himself, but he has left me, and I have no encouragement, and stand no show in getting a reduction of the bill unless the chairman of the steering committee helps me. Therefore I did not call the attention of the House to that item, which is about twice as large as it was in 1917. Possibly we could have saved \$200,000 to the program of the gentleman from Wyoming. But I want to say that I am gratified that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], a member of the committee, informs the House that this economy was not effected by the steering committee or by Mr. MONDELL or by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it really was effected by the Secretary of State. He says that the Secretary of State told him that they could cut it out.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not recall in any period of the last two Congresses that the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the steering committee, endeavored to cut down the appropriations.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, we never had any steering committee. We believed in and had confidence in the committees and their qualifications, and that they would do the right and proper thing. We did not have any steering committee where one man is worth 25 votes. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Moore, and now Mr. DARROW, is considered by your plan of organization to be worth 25 times as much, with 25 times more sense and 25 times more judgment, with 25 times more influence, than your distinguished leader Mr. MONDELL. We did not have committees appointed in that way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is talking at cross purposes. I was not speaking of the committee on committees.

Mr. KITCHIN. We did not have one.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was talking of the steering committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. We did not have a steering committee.

Mr. BAER. The gentleman from North Carolina is talking about the committee on committees.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from North Carolina always refuses to discuss that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from North Dakota does not understand his own organization and none of the other Republicans understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hope the gentleman from North Carolina can have his time extended so as to answer my question. I think it is important that the gentleman explain the work of his steering committee. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLANTON. The regular order is, Is there objection? If the leader on this side of the House can not have five minutes I object and I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the Republicans do not want me to tell them about their own organization—

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to have the gentleman tell us about his steering committee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was being taken, when Mr. ROGERS asked for tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is out of order when the Chair has found that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ROGERS. The Chair has not announced that there was no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. No; but he knows that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on ordering tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROGERS and Mr. BLANTON.

The committee divided.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from North Carolina can have five minutes, I will withdraw the point of no quorum before the announcement is made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his point of no quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not withdraw the point of no quorum.

The tellers reported that there were 2 ayes and 55 noes.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers report on this vote that the ayes are 2 and the noes are 55, so the committee refuses to rise. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Texas has made a point of order that there is no quorum present. That is pending. Pending the point of order that there is no quorum present the motion was made that the committee rise. That has been voted down. The point of order that no quorum is present is still pending unless the gentleman withdraws it.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized, I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his point of order, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present, a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Chair on his arithmetic, although I counted more than the Chairman did. I really do not want to appear discourteous to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. I really had nothing to say, but he asked me a question, and I was cut off, so that it made it appear that I was very discourteous.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman will pardon me, but he took five minutes a few moments ago in evading an answer to my question. Now, will he take these five minutes in answering it? I am referring to the steering committee, and the gentleman was speaking about the committee on committees.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, since I have been in Congress the Democrats have never had a steering committee, for the reason that the chairman of the various legislative committees were selected only with reference to their superior qualifications for the position. We had no such method as now prevails in the Republican organization at all. We appointed all committees with reference to the qualification of the men appointed upon them, and it was never necessary for them to have an overlord or boss. We never jacked them up and said, "Here is what we want you to do or not to do." They reported out the various bills, and they were accepted as such because we had confidence in their judgment, wisdom, and patriotism. While I was the majority leader I never had to call anyone down, because they always did the proper thing; and to show you that they did the proper thing, my friend LONGWORTH voted for everything that was reported out, except one bill—yes; he voted for the revenue bill—in 1916; so you see our committees had sense enough to legislate and recommend legislation themselves. It was legislation that appealed not only to our approval and judgment but to that of Mr. LONGWORTH and the judgment of many others on the Republican side.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is speaking of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The discussion that is now proceeding has nothing to do with the measure under consideration and the motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to get to the point of how this bill comes in here—

Mr. WALSH. Oh, the gentleman told us about that this morning. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not going to insist on violating the rules. Of course, if the gentleman from Massachusetts does not want all of the Republicans present to know the manner of their organization and what unheard-of methods they have adopted, such as were never before adopted in a legislative body in the world—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, of course, I shall have to wait. Only about half a dozen of you know how it is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOWS OR HEIRS OF DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS WHO DIE ABROAD.

Payment under the provisions of section 1749 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the widows or heirs at law of diplomatic or consular officers of the United States dying in foreign countries in the discharge of their duties, \$5,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend by inserting the words "or consular" after the word "diplomatic," in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 13, after the word "diplomatic" insert the words "and consular."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the salaries of the commissioner and the necessary engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, computers, and clerks in the field and at the seat of government, rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing and necessary traveling, for payment for timber necessarily cut in determining the boundary line not to exceed \$500, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty or actual expenses not exceeding \$5 per day each to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$55,000, together with the unexpended balances of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties: *Provided*, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence, not in excess of \$8 per day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, on page 12, line 8, after the word "Washington," I move to insert the words "and from his regular place of residence."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 8, after the word "Washington" insert the words "and from his regular place of residence."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not aim this amendment at this particular individual, but I expect to offer a similar amendment at other places in the bill in respect to other commissions of this kind. My understanding is—and I do not know that this has been true recently, but my attention has been called to at least one case in which a commissioner of this kind had spent a good deal of time at his regular residence away from Washington, and while at home was claiming to have been performing part of his duties, and since he was away from Washington had been collecting his \$8 per day expense account. I do not make the charge against the man performing this particular service, but it does seem to me it is a very fair provision to insert in respect to all of these commissions that if the commissioner is at home where his regular residence is, he shall not be allowed to collect \$8 a day expenses because he happens to be away from Washington and may be performing some of his duties, such as the preparing of reports and things of that kind. If he chooses to go to his regular residence it does not seem to me that he ought to be allowed to collect per diem expenses. I take it that as far as the point of order is concerned it is a limitation on the appropriation and under the Holman rule it would be in order.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, right there I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the committee can not accept an amendment with a point of order reserved against it.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to ask the chairman a question while he is on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that we dispose now first of the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. It is legislation and it does not reduce expenses. It rather increases them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is right along with that particular proviso. It is no more legislation than the proviso itself. It seems to me that it would be in order. On the other hand, it does not seem to me to be anything more than a qualification and limitation on the language of the second proviso.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, still further reserving the point of order, do I understand the gentleman's amendment is to insert after the word "Washington," in line 8, "from his official place of residence"?

Mr. CONNALLY. From his regular place of residence. A further limitation that I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise to ask of the chairman of the committee what the unexpended balance in this section amounts to, and also, if it would not be out of order, I would like to know what the unexpended balance appropriated in section 9 refers to? I am absolutely opposed to the reappropriation of those unexpended balances, because I do not think the House knows just what it is appropriating when that matter is not gone into more fully. And I would like to ask the chairman—

Mr. PORTER. So far as the boundary commission is concerned, the balance will all be used before the end of the fiscal year. There is an unexpended balance in the emergency fund. Mr. Carr, who appeared before the committee, stated that it would be impossible for him to say how much the unexpended balance would be on account of the nature of the fund. They might have use for \$100,000 or \$200,000 in the next three or four months, and they might not have to use \$100.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day, I think it is very bad practice for this House to appropriate lump sums and also to reappropriate these unexpended balances, because the House is not informed as to what an unexpended balance is going to amount to. And it seems to me if the department asks for a certain amount of money for the next fiscal year we ought to appropriate the definite sum of money that they ask for, or that we think they ought to have, and there ought not to be any doubt in carrying these old accounts from one year after another. For years, since I have been on this Foreign Affairs Committee, these unexpended balances have been carried right along on the books of the department. I do not suppose they have ever been closed at the end of the year, because the reappropriation carries it over to the next year and to the next year after that; and so we go on appropriating unexpended balances in these bills year after year. I think it is very bad practice, and I think we should consider it, and we certainly ought to get out of the habit of appropriating these sums without the knowledge of the House and not knowing just what they amount to.

I felt that I ought to say something about this, and I do hope the committee in its next bill will try to get away from that and try to appropriate, as I have said, definite sums for the various fiscal years in accordance with what the gentlemen think is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how long this commission has been in existence? I think it is beyond my memory entirely, and I would like to know how long it is.

Mr. PORTER. I want to say it was provided by a convention in 1903.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Some 16 or 17 years ago, then?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Are they ever going to get through?

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will answer him.

The commissioner has done a splendid piece of work. He has completed all of the field work. The line has all been monumentalized, with the exception of possibly two or three months of work. All of the data are now in Washington, and they are assembling it so as to make the necessary maps. The commissioner impressed the members of the committee with the fact that he was extremely efficient and extremely diligent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is there but one commissioner now?

Mr. PORTER. Just one; yes, sir.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has not, as I understand, fully answered my question as to when they would be through?



Mr. PORTER. I asked the commissioner that question, and he said he thought it would take three or four years to complete the office work and assemble all of this data and put it in the form of maps so that the official report could be made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What is the salary of the commissioner?

Mr. PORTER. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I am not surprised that it will be continued for three or four years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU AT BRUSSELS FOR THE REPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.

To meet the share of the United States in the expense of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African Continent of firearms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors for the year 1921, \$125.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] and to the House, and especially to the gentleman on my right here, that I made some very honest and hearty efforts, unavailing though they were, to help in the economy program, reducing items when I was sure they ought not to be in here, or could be cut out or reduced. I want to make one more effort, and if the committee does not feel that it should respond to these appeals for economy, I shall give up, the same as Mr. MONDELL, and let the gentleman take charge himself.

I am in sympathy with this bill, and I think that the committee has done fine work, and I hope that the committee will receive some credit for it and that the Secretary of State will not get all the credit for this economy. I realize that we must have far more appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service now than in prewar times, and the committee has given a very strong and convincing argument in its report as to why we should. I greatly sympathize with them in their statement, and I am speaking sincerely now. [Laughter.]

The reasons for the large increase of appropriations over prewar times are threefold, as contained in the report. First, in the prewar period we were frequently a debtor nation. Now we are the biggest creditor nation in the world, holding the obligations of other nations in the sum of \$11,000,000,000 and upward—all under a Democratic administration. For the 40 or 50 years of the Republican administrations we were unfortunately a debtor nation. Now, under Woodrow Wilson, a Democratic administration—and this committee in its report is absolutely right about that—we are the largest creditor nation in the world. I want our Democratic friends to put a peg there. That is one great change in our international relations.

Mr. BAER. Can the gentleman assure us that we will get our money back?

Mr. KITCHIN. I can not yield. The second reason that is given for these increased appropriations is that in the prewar period we were without a merchant marine. To-day we have over 6,000,000 tons of shipping flying the American flag and carrying the products of the industries and farms of America to all the markets of the world. For 40 or 50 years of Republican rule less than 10 per cent of our American products were sent abroad in American bottoms. More than 90 per cent of American products were sent out to the markets of the world in foreign bottoms, foreign ships flying the foreign flag. But to-day, under a Democratic administration, this committee in its report solemnly assures us that our merchant marine has grown from nothing to 6,000,000 tons, a larger tonnage than any nation except Great Britain. Every man ought to be proud of this wonderful accomplishment of the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The third reason the committee give for these increased appropriations is that we practically now control the gold supply of the world. For 40 or 50 years, under Republican rule, we were borrowing money from abroad to get enough gold to run our own domestic industries and enterprises; but now, to-day, under Democratic control, we own and control the gold supply of the world, and every Nation on earth must come to this great United States and ask us to lend them gold—a great accomplishment of the Democratic administration. I know that if the committee had thought about it one minute they never would have put that in the report. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWNE. How does the national debt compare now with our debt under a Republican administration?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, on account of Republican votes during this Democratic administration our debt, incurred to win the war, has risen considerably; not as much as the Republicans wanted it to rise, because they voted for greater appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more to get on to my amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes to speak on his amendment. [Laughter.] Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I have an amendment here. I now see the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] present. I was going to send for him. Here is another item where we can economize.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir. Here is an item that we can reduce to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 12, line 19, strike out "\$125" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120."

[Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, gentlemen, I have been fighting here for economy for four hours to help out the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. I have tried to save \$200,000 in one item, and \$150,000 in another item, and \$138,000 in still another, and I have made up my mind that if I can not save \$5 out of this bill I should give up and let the gentleman from Wyoming take charge of the whole thing and economize as well as he can. [Laughter.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that that is a treaty obligation?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, well, I will not violate any treaty in the world. If it is a treaty obligation, I am evidently mistaken in my amendment. If not, I appeal to you let us save \$5, at least. [Laughter.] If this is a treaty obligation and we have solemnly bound ourselves to the countries of the world, as it were, in a league of nations to pay \$125 a year to repress the African slave trade and keep liquor from going into a certain zone in Africa, I will not ask this House and my Democratic friends to help me violate a solemn treaty obligation. No, sir; I am more afraid the Republicans would vote to cut it down anyway. Maybe they would, with the gentleman from Wyoming overlording this committee completely. [Laughter.]

I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming, if I may be permitted to say so in my five minutes, that during his absence this committee has violated every tenet of economy in the gentleman's program. They have failed to vote for a single amendment cutting down a single appropriation.

Now, I shall have to leave. I hope the gentleman from Wyoming will take this job and keep up with it, and wherever amendments ought to be offered to reduce items in the bill I hope he will offer. I suggest one place where he can offer an amendment that will result in economy. The appropriation provided for this post allowance is \$600,000. That was put in there in order to enable the department to increase secretaries' salaries so as to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living, but that was done before we increased the salaries of the secretaries. Now that we have increased the secretaries' salaries a thousand dollars each, which amounts to \$130,000, the gentleman from Wyoming can, and in good conscience no doubt he will, offer an amendment when we reach that page, page 22, to reduce the appropriation of \$600,000 to \$470,000, which would save \$130,000. That is perfectly just, perfectly right, and perfectly in accordance with the program of economy. Now, gentlemen, I am not going to try to help you any more in your economy program. You threw me down the very first thing, and I am not going to have anything more to do with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] to strike out "\$125" and insert "\$120."

Mr. KITCHIN. Since somebody has reminded me that this \$125 is in conformity with a solemn treaty obligation, I do not want to put myself in the light of trying to violate a treaty, because I am going to help to keep it in good faith, and I respectfully withdraw the amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, I am very much disappointed in the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I just came into the House to aid him in his worthy effort to reduce this bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. We lost the opportunity to reduce it that many thousands while the gentleman was absent.

Mr. MONDELL. I have just come in, only to find the gentleman occupying the time of the House in an effort to reduce the bill \$125.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Five dollars.

Mr. MONDELL. Five dollars. He now asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion.

Mr. KITCHIN. To keep the treaty.

Mr. MONDELL. I am very painfully disappointed, but under the circumstances I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KREIDER. Reserving the right to object, I think it is unreasonable and unfair to the representatives of the Democratic Party on the floor of the House to stop their agitation for economy in the usual Democratic way. Whenever there is a chance to cut off \$5 we see them on the job, but when there is a chance to save \$5,000,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. We are still on the job.

Mr. KREIDER. They forget that they are present. If the \$5,000,000 is to be saved, it is up to the Republicans to save it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object— [Laughter.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. KREIDER. I think we should have a vote on this amendment, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made to withdrawing the amendment. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this because the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] in his last speech called attention to the fact that in the report of the chairman of this committee it was pointed out that we had long been a debtor nation and that now we are a creditor nation to the extent of about \$11,000,000,000. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] seemed to think the credit for that ought to belong to the Democratic Party. He further pointed to the item in the report which refers to the increased shipping that is flying the American flag on the seas, and again he wanted to lay claim for the credit for that to the Democratic Party.

I want sincerely to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, Does he also claim credit for the Democratic Party for the 70,000 graves of American manhood, the cleanest, purest, and brightest that ever lived under the Stars and Stripes? Does the Democratic Party want credit for those 70,000 graves, those 70,000 boys, in each of whose homes there is a vacant chair? Does the gentleman from North Carolina want to claim credit for the Democratic Party for the fact that there are over 100,000 boys in this country compelled to go through life without an arm or without a leg or with their faces disfigured beyond recognition? It seems to me that the gentleman from North Carolina has been in Congress too long and occupies too high a place in the esteem of the public, not only among the Democrats but, may I advise him, among the Republicans as well, to make light of a bill of this kind and to treat with ridicule and burlesque a thing that ought to be sacred to every American. As far as giving the Democratic Party credit for our being a creditor nation, there were many millions of Americans who were not Democrats who gave just as loyally of their sons and just as generously of their dollars in order that the Great War might be won with the minimum of sacrifice. The immediate and unusual prosperity that has come to America is not due to any act passed by the Democratic Party while in power. It is due to a disaster, to a calamity that struck the human race, and I deplore the fact, as a member of the opposite party, that the gentleman should allow his words to go out to this country in a spirit of jest, because many a mother will say, "I wonder if I owe to the Democratic Party the sacrifice of my son?"

Mr. KITCHIN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PORTER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this item close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that I only claimed credit for what the report gives us credit for. I do not claim credit for the Democratic Party for the 100,000 Americans who were killed over there or for the nearly 200,000 who were wounded. Who ever heard me claiming any credit for the Democratic Party for that? If I had had my way, not one of them would have been killed or wounded. I so voted, but practically every Republican in the House, as well as every Democrat in the House voted for the war. It was not a Democratic war. It was not a Republican war. It was an American war, and of course I will not give credit for it to either party. I think the Republican Party is entitled to as much credit for the 100,000 men who were killed or died and for the 200,000 men who were wounded as the Democratic Party, and I have not tried to take any credit from the Republican Party on that. But I will tell you what we Democrats do claim credit for. When those 200,000 boys came back—boys with arms and legs shot off or with eyes shot out—and the question before this House was how to rehabilitate those boys, your party almost to a man voted against a \$4,000,000 appropriation, while we Democrats voted for \$4,000,000 to help make life worth living for those boys. [Applause.] We do claim that we have done and will continue to do all in our power to help these maimed, crippled boys. We sent them abroad to risk their lives and limbs, and when they were brought back here wounded and maimed I do want to resent and protest against the action of the Republicans in Congress in refusing to give them the little pittance of \$4,000,000 to help rehabilitate them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$8 per day each, and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, is hereby appropriated, \$30,400: *Provided*, That in probate and administration proceedings there shall be collected by said clerk, before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, the same inheritance taxes from time to time collected under the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States from the estates of decedents residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, after the colon strike out balance of paragraph and insert:

"*Provided*, That hereafter in each private and administration proceeding in said courts there shall be, and is hereby, levied on each respective estate and there shall be assessed and collected by the clerk of the court before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, as fees of court, an amount of money equal to the amount of inheritance taxes that would be due and collectible under the laws of the United States in the case of the estate of a decedent who resided within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of an equal value."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, to that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the language already contained in the bill has been made in order by a special rule. The amendment which I offer does not change the effect.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, yes; the amendment uses the word "hereafter," which makes it not in order. I am simply reserving the point of order. I do not know that I will make it.

Mr. GARNER. The word "hereafter" makes it permanent law.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that, and that is one reason why I offer the amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That makes it subject to a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman may be correct about that. I am not a parliamentary expert. My object in offering the amendment is to make clear what I think was the intention of the committee in drafting this provision. It seems to me that, although we call these amounts fees of courts, in a sense it is really the levy of inheritance taxes prevailing in the United States on the estates of decedents whose estates are administered by the United States Court for China. It seems to me that we ought to make it clear that Congress is levying it and collecting it according to the same standards that prevail in the United States. The language used in the bill is:

*Provided*, That in probate and administration proceedings there shall be collected by said clerk, before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, the same inheritance



taxes from time to time collected under the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States from the estates of decedents residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

I believe that if the chairman of the committee will consider the language of my amendment he will have no objection to it. I can see no reason why these citizens who reside in China and whose estates pay no inheritance tax by reason of the residence of the decedents in China should not contribute to the expenses of maintaining the court in China. I can see no reason why they should not be forced to pay their share of the administration of the United States court in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not understand this provision. The probate administration proceedings are upon the estates of whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. American citizens residing in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They would not be citizens of the United States unless they were residents of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. They might be; there are a great many people, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, who have property in China and are American citizens. I will say that the United States court for China was established through treaty relations with China which expressly confer upon that court jurisdiction not only over the estates but over persons of American citizens, residents in China. The Chinese laws have no jurisdiction over American citizens in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is true; but the jurisdiction of the court will depend upon the settled principles that apply to citizens of this country. I should suppose that a man's citizenship in this country would depend somewhat on his intention as to coming back here.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa—he is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means—if the Federal inheritance tax now in force could be collected from an estate of an American citizen residing in China. And I would like to observe that if it does not, this amendment ought to be adopted, because they ought to pay an inheritance tax—I mean a Federal inheritance tax, the same as the estate of an American citizen residing in the United States would pay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman on that; but the point I raised, and which I am not absolutely sure about, is one upon which I would like information. At first blush it seems to me as if the whole proviso was not necessary. However, it may be necessary.

Mr. CONNALLY. We had the judge of the United States court for China before us, and he gave it as his opinion that the Federal inheritance-tax law did not apply to American citizens residing in China. It was on his approval and at his suggestion that the committee inserted this language in the bill, in order that the inheritance tax from the estates of American citizens might be paid and help to defray the expenses of that court and maintain the court.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have not examined personally into the subject, and I will yield to the judgment of the judge of the court for China and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that the rules of the House provide that the paragraph be permitted to remain in the bill, and it may be perfected by a germane amendment; but that does not permit an amendment which would add additional legislation. It has been held that an amendment on all fours with this was out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment with the word "hereafter" stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not make the ruling on the word "hereafter," but on the general proposition that it adds new legislation to the existing legislation in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the attention of the Chair been called to the language of the bill as it stands on page 16? That is new legislation, if the Chair please, and that was made in order this morning by the special rule.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only reason the gentleman's amendment would be in order, if it is germane.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to know wherein it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not hold that it is not germane. The Chair simply holds that while it is germane, it adds new legislation to the legislation carried on page 16 of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will examine that language he will see that the intended effect of the language is identical. It simply changes the language in order to make it clearer how the clerk will arrive at the amount which

he shall be required to collect in each case. The effect of it is identically the same, and if the language on page 16, as contained in the printed bill, is in order, there can be no question on earth that my amendment is in order. Since the Chair holds that the word "hereafter" does not render it out of order, I insist that my original amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets very much to be obliged to differ with the gentleman. If this were on a legislative bill, the Chair thinks that he would hold the amendment to be in order, but this is an appropriation bill, and what applies to a legislative bill does not apply to an appropriation bill. Anything that adds new legislation to the pending section under the rules of the House can not be in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. I move to amend, in line 17, by striking out the figures "\$30,400" and inserting as a new paragraph at the bottom of the page the words and figures "Total, \$30,400." That is simply an oral change, so as to have the item showing the total carried at the end of the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, strike out the figures "\$30,400" and at the bottom of the page insert a new paragraph, as follows:  
"Total, \$30,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the International High Commission arising in such work and investigations as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why this has been changed from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of State. In the current law, if I read it correctly, it says that this expenditure shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered that matter very carefully and concluded it would be better to make the expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State on account of its diplomatic character. It was formerly under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TILSON. The bill provides—

arising in such work and investigation as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

It was formerly under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, including rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing, and necessary traveling expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, \$25,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subsistence of the commission or secretary, except for actual and necessary expenses, not in excess of \$8 per day each, when absent from Washington on official business: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for salaries of commissioners in excess of \$3,500 each per annum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 19, line 12, by inserting after the word "Washington" the words "and from his regular place of residence." It is the same amendment that I offered to the other commission.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the word "Washington," insert "and from his regular place of residence."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of interpreters to consulates and guards.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 3, page 23, by inserting the words "and guards" after the word "interpreters," and by striking out in line 4 the words "and guards."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 23, line 3, after the word "interpreters," insert the words "and guards," and in line 4, strike out the words "and guards."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreters and guards to be employed at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$103,700.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the reason for this expenditure and for the employment of interpreters to courts and consulates? Is that to China, Japan, and Siberia?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. And in the Turkish dominions?

Mr. PORTER. Yes. We lumped the two items.

Mr. TILSON. Last year there were two items, and the result is different.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. We were requested to increase it by \$15,000 by the Secretary of State, for very good reasons, which he stated. It is an increase of only \$15,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there are a good many places outside of the oriental countries where expert linguistic assistance is required. For example, take the new Republic of Yugoslavia. That is made up of several different peoples, who are linguistically different. A man to be an efficient and useful officer at that legation is expected to speak six different languages. It is exceedingly difficult to get a man who can fulfill those requirements anywhere. We have insisted from year to year in this bill that Americanizing of the service shall go forward just as fast as possible. But in some places, such as the one I have cited, and in the Orient, it has been practically impossible to get the right sort of Americans who could speak several languages. In order to overcome that situation the State Department asked this year for a new item for salary of alien employees, amounting to \$50,000, so that here and there throughout the capitals of the world it might be able to procure competent alien subordinates. The committee was not inclined to broaden the capacity of the State Department to go afield and hire alien employees to any great extent. But the representations of the State Department were so urgent as to certain places which are to be raised to legation or embassy rank, as a result of the war, or at which consulates have been or may be established, that we concluded that we could help out the State Department without deviating from our principle by increasing this interpreter item by \$15,000.

So the actual effect of the committee action was to cut down by \$35,000 net the estimate of the State Department.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has not explained why in the current law it is specified that the expenditure is to be made at certain places, naming some 8 or 10 of them. Now, it is combined into one item, and no place whatever is named, so it might be expended anywhere over the whole world.

Mr. ROGERS. The fund is not a very large one, and of course the need of interpreters is limited to a relatively few portions of the world. It seemed to us that a certain degree of fluidity or elasticity could not do any harm to the service and might make more effective operation possible. Therefore we simply grouped the three items into one, so far as the amount asked for was concerned, and then cut \$35,000 from the total.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman a question in reference to an item we passed and a claim that is made by the chairman. I notice in the report the chairman filed that he stated the post-allowances estimate by the State Department was \$1,800,000.

Mr. PORTER. That is a mistake of the printer. He made a mistake of a million dollars.

Mr. FLOOD. Then the difference in the estimates of the State Department and the amount carried by this bill is less by one million—

Mr. PORTER. No; the totals are correct. The original manuscript which I sent to the printer shows \$800,000, but the printer made it \$1,800,000, and it was too late to change it.

Mr. FLOOD. The total of \$11,913,000 is correct?

Mr. PORTER. It is not included in the total. The \$800,000 is included in the total.

Mr. FLOOD. Then the amount stated in the total is correct?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EXPENSES, PASSPORT-CONTROL ACT.

For expenses of regulating entry into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, and Public Act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the latter act shall have become effective, \$250,000, in addition to the remaining \$150,000 of the sum appropriated by section 4 of said Public Act No. 79.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNALLY: Page 23, line 23, at the end of the paragraph insert:

"Provided, That a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each citizen's passport issued from the Department of State, and a similar fee for each visé by United States diplomatic or consular officers on each foreign passport, to be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund for the carrying into effect of the purposes of this paragraph and the reduction of the sum therein appropriated."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the announced intention of the committee to adopt measures to reduce expenditures and to adopt a policy of economy. All of us ought to exercise the most strict economy of which we are capable. As Representatives it is our solemn duty to do so. While this item appropriates \$250,000 in addition to an unexpended balance of \$150,000 already appropriated for carrying into effect the passport control act, if the House will adopt the amendment which I propose and which I really believe a goodly number of gentlemen on the committee favor, every dollar of this \$400,000 appropriation will remain in the United States Treasury and not one cent will have to be expended.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there not a fee now of \$2?

Mr. CONNALLY. One dollar. The present fee, Mr. Chairman, is only \$1 for each passport, and a dollar for the visé of a foreign passport when presented to our consuls and diplomatic officers in foreign lands.

Mr. ROGERS. The fee is \$2 in each case, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Here is the statute on the subject. I have it before me. The gentleman from Massachusetts is no doubt confused by the fact that when a person makes an application for a passport away from Washington he is required to pay 50 cents for an affidavit and the clerk of the court 50 cents. But that does not go to the State Department at all.

Mr. ROGERS. One dollar for the department and another dollar either to the State court or the Federal court where the application is made.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. ROGERS. The application is made before the Federal court and goes into the Federal Treasury, but in the case of the visé, which is covered under this paragraph, the unvarying fee is \$2, according to the testimony before the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that only \$1 goes into the Federal Treasury for the issuance of a passport. The other goes to a notary public or clerk, or somebody. The testimony before our committee discloses, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the Secretary favors an increase of the passport fee, and Mr. Carr, of the consular department, suggested that by increasing these fees the expenses of the department could be materially reduced. In the hearings on page 24, Part I, Mr. Carr testified:

Mr. ROGERS. In the earlier hearings before the committee.

Mr. CARR. The passport bureau itself is collecting fees at the rate of—for instance, it issued passports at the rate of 150,000 a year here in Washington.

Secretary LANSING. I think you could make a considerable increase.

Mr. CARR. It used to be \$5 and it was reduced to \$1.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you really want to economize, if you will adopt this amendment it will bring into the Treasury of the United States more, I believe, than \$1,000,000. The bill appropriates in this one item \$400,000. To do what? To compensate clerks and employees in foreign countries. To do what? To visé passports for foreigners who are desirous of coming to the United States. Now, I believe that the Congress of the United States is justified in assuming an attitude with reference to such foreigners that will require them to contribute at least a part of the expense of maintaining that service, and it will not be contended that it is not worth \$5 to secure the visé of a passport in a foreign country. In the case of our own citizens who travel in foreign lands, most of them either go there for business purposes or on



pleasure trips; and in their case, I submit to this committee, they are more than able to pay the small sum of \$5 for a passport. The Government of the United States is now expending stupendous sums in maintaining the passport bureau and in maintaining its agencies in foreign countries. I believe if the members of the majority in this House are sincere in their desire for economy, if they really believe we ought to reduce expenses, if they believe that all the money ought not to go out of the Treasury, but at least a little ought to be brought into the Treasury, this amendment should be adopted. I want to say to the gentleman—

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?  
Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of State had testified before the committee that he believed in this increase. My recollection is otherwise. I wondered if the gentleman could refer to the page of the testimony.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I could if the gentleman would give me a little more time.

Mr. ROGERS. The testimony on this point appears on pages 23 and 24 of part 1 of the hearings, and, so far as I know, that is the only place where this subject has been discussed by the Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is in the hearings. I looked it up last night. I remember it distinctly. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, part 1, page 24, I think he will find the statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit some remarks on the point of order. I assume that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], who I believe it was reserved the point of order, will urge the Chair to hold the amendment not in order, because it is legislation; but I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under the Holman rule anything that reduces an appropriation, even though it be in its nature legislative, is in order on a general appropriation bill.

By the exact language of the amendment itself it directs that these sums be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund—to do what? To carry out the purpose of this section and reduce this appropriation. What else do we find? We find in the hearings the testimony that here in Washington at least 150,000 passports are issued each year. An increase from \$1 to \$5 would make quite an increase in revenue. Four dollars per head for 150,000 passports would amount to \$600,000, a sum more than sufficient to wipe out the entire sums appropriated in this particular section. This is without taking into account the great number in foreign countries.

I want to call the attention of the Chair to a fact that will not be disputed. Under existing law the fee for issuing passports is only \$1. Under the Holman rule it seems to me obvious that this amendment is in order, because its effect is to reduce the appropriation and to reduce the expenditures by reason of this particular provision.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The gentleman says the only charge now is \$1?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I was at the Department of State on day before yesterday with some friends, and I saw them pay for a passport. The bill presented was \$2.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from West Virginia was not in the Hall a moment ago when I explained that only \$1 goes to the Federal Government. The other 50 cents is for a notary fee and 50 cents for other expenses.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I am glad to be informed.

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me this would not impose a burden on the person applying for a passport. I am not urging this as a partisan, but I am urging it here as a Representative, believing that when we have an opportunity to thus easily bring into the Treasury of the United States more than a million dollars, which will materially assist in defraying the expenses of maintaining this service, we ought not to hesitate to do so. I very much hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will not make the point of order.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am wondering, in view of the discussion by the gentleman, and in view of the fact that this whole question was discussed in the committee, why it is that the gentleman did not present some sort of provision of this kind when the bill was up for consideration before the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] did bring the matter up.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. My recollection is that the whole matter was to be left pending, for time to include this, as well as other matters, in the way of new legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I said a moment ago, I am not urging this as a partisan matter. I thought the gentleman had in mind some permanent legislation.

If objection is to be made to the amendment on the ground that its effect will be to make permanent the raise in passport fees from \$1 to \$5, I shall be content that the amendment be so modified as to make it operative for the life of the present appropriation bill.

I shall within the next few days introduce a bill providing by permanent law that passport and visé fees shall be \$5 instead of \$1.

The records of the Department of State disclose that passports are being now issued at Washington at the average rate of 156,000 per year. Before the war immigrants were arriving in the United States on an average of about 1,000,000 annually. At the present time the average is 540,000 per year.

Fees on the present average issuance of passports and inspection of passports of aliens will bring into the Treasury nearly three and one-half millions of dollars annually.

When conditions of foreign travel become more settled hundreds of thousands more tourists will leave the United States to visit foreign countries within the next year or two. An increasing number of other citizens will go abroad in connection with foreign trade. Each of them will spend hundreds of dollars on each trip, and a passport fee of \$5 will be a mere bagatelle as compared with the expense of such trip and will in no case deter a single individual from embarking on such a journey. Foreigners will apply to our consulates and embassies in foreign countries to have their passports examined and approved for entry into the United States. The passport fee of \$5 will be to them, as compared with the expenses of their voyage, a mere trifle.

However, in the aggregate the fees if increased will bring into the Treasury of the United States annually about two and a quarter million dollars more than now received, to assist in defraying the expenses of maintaining the passport control system.

American consulates, legations, and embassies are maintained in foreign lands for purposes of maintaining international relations and for the convenience of American citizens and for the protection of their rights as they relate to foreign countries.

This service in its larger aspect is national in its character. It pertains to the welfare of the whole people and the prestige of our country. It involves the possibilities of peace and war and trade and commerce as they may be affected by our relations to the other nations of the earth.

But as to that portion of the foreign service that deals with the issuance of passports it may be said that this is a service particularly enjoyed by those of our citizens who journey abroad. Is it not fair and equitable that they should make at least a slight contribution to its maintenance in the payment of a small fee for a service which to them is of great value and usefulness? Is it not just that foreigners intending to journey to the United States should be required to pay a reasonable fee for a service which facilitates their entry into the United States?

It has been urged that the raising of the passport fee constitutes the levy of a tax. That is only partially true, and yet if it were wholly true is not a valid or persuasive argument against the amendment. A passport fee is a tax only in a sense that it is a tax upon those individuals who derive a particular and peculiar benefit or privilege not enjoyed by the public at large. It is only a requirement that the enjoyment of a special service shall entail on those so enjoying it the duty to at least partially compensate the Government for the expenses incurred in rendering the service.

The fees collected through an increase in the raise will make it possible for the tax laws to bear a little more lightly in some other form or feature. The fees collected by the Department of State for passports will operate to very materially reduce the expenses of that department and to reduce the amounts which otherwise would have to be appropriated out of the General Treasury.

If the Congress really desires to lighten the tax burden, if gentlemen of the majority party in truth desire to be economical in the financial affairs of the United States, they now have an opportunity to put into practice their pretensions by the adoption of this amendment. A little later they will have another opportunity of justifying their widely heralded profession by passing the bill which I propose to introduce raising the passport fees from \$1 to \$5.

At this time when the national expenditures are so stupendous in their proportions, when unprecedented sums in the form of taxes must be laid upon the people of the United States to maintain the various agencies of government established for the protection of the rights of the people of the United States and the convenience of its citizens, the Congress should exercise the most careful and painstaking economy in the fiscal affairs of the Government.

Gentlemen, will you refuse or decline to accept this concrete, tangible proposal to bring money into the Federal Treasury from a source that can contribute it without inconvenience. Here is an opportunity to bring money into the Treasury and not to take it out of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. I propose to make it, and if the Chair is in doubt I would like to be heard on it. I want to say one word, however, before the point of order is made. There may be a great deal of merit in the fundamental proposal of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. On the other hand, I was present during the entire discussion, when the Secretary of State and his assistants were before the committee, on these matters and allied matters. I listened very carefully, and I have no recollection whatever that the Secretary of State advocated larger fees. I do not know what the plan of the chairman of the committee may be, but I assume that he would say in a matter of this importance, where the policy of the country has been otherwise for a good many years, that we should go into this specifically and carefully and take testimony from all sides, and then, if so decided, bring a substantive proposal before the House. For that reason and for that reason only, and without seeking to prejudge the matter adversely, I make the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a moment solely on the point of order. I submit to the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is clearly in order under our rules. It is legislation, it is true, and apart from the Holman rule it would be out of order. Further it will not be in order under the Holman rule, unless this particular provision of law proposed by the gentleman from Texas, will operate to bring about a reduction in the amount carried in the bill. If it brings about a reduction in the amount carried in the bill, then it comes clearly and absolutely within the Holman rule. It is not necessary for an amendment to be in order, that it shall be directed to the reduction of some particular item in the bill. It is enough if the proposition that is proposed, in the judgment of the Chair, will in its operation fairly operate by its own force to bring about a reduction of expenditures. Speaker Kerr and Chairman W. L. Wilson both ruled that the purpose of the Holman rule is most beneficent and proper, and the rule should have a liberal construction. (Hinds', vol. 4, p. 594.)

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this legislation will operate to furnish an additional fund, and thereby reduce the present amount required from the Treasury.

This amendment will provide a fund from new sources, that will render unnecessary the full amount of the appropriation of \$250,000 which the bill now carries. The fund to be provided by the legislation contained in the amendment is set aside for application to the very objects provided for in the specific appropriation of \$250,000.

Permit me to call the attention of the Chair to the following citation from Fourth Hinds' (RECORD, 1st sess., 52d Cong., p. 1792) from a ruling made on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Judge De Armond. I desire specifically to call attention to the fact that the effect of this amendment was nothing like so apparent on its face as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The amendment of Judge De Armond was to a pension appropriation bill and consisted merely of these words, "was, or other." The effect of the amendment was to increase the number of persons prohibited from receiving the benefits of a clause in the pension law, thereby as a necessary sequence reducing the number of pensioners. The point was made that the amendment did not show on its face that it reduced expenditures. But it was easy to see that a reduction in the number of pensioners, necessarily reduced the amount that would be required for the payment of pensions, though the amendment was not directed to the amount of money actually appropriated by the bill. The amendment was held to be in order under the Holman rule.

While it was not specifically directed to reducing the amount of money carried in the bill for the payment of pensions, the Chair was justified in concluding—and in order to make his ruling he had to so conclude—that in the execution of the pension laws the amount required for the payment of pensions would be reduced by the effect of the amendment.

I thoroughly agree that it is not in order to propose legislation on an appropriation bill, and at the same time reduce the amount carried in the bill, when the legislation is not related to and does not effect the reduction. In such a case the legislation is not in order. The legislation itself must effect a reduction. It must appear to the Chair that it will effect a reduction. If the Chair is satisfied from the law of the land, the evidence in the hearings, and his knowledge of public affairs that in consequence of the legislation proposed a reduction will be effected, then the amendment will come within the Holman rule. This principle can not be gainsaid.

This is an appropriation for \$250,000 for definite purposes. The gentleman from Texas proposes legislation which will raise a fund that will be applied to the same purposes, and to the extent of the new fund raised by the taxation provided by this amendment, the amount of the present appropriation may be reduced. It will therefore effect, so far as the bill is concerned, a reduction in the amount carried in this bill, because the amendment is directly applied to the very purpose of creating a new fund by new taxation for the payment of the expenses provided for by the present appropriation. Hence, the legislation being related to the reduction, and the chairman knowing the public business of the country, knowing the laws of the land, and knowing the very large number of persons that will be chargeable by the increased taxation proposed is in a position to say that in his judgment a reduction will be effected by the legislation proposed and that therefore the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, just a word on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Much as I respect the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] upon all parliamentary questions I can not agree that the Chair is permitted to exercise such broad discretion as he now contends as to the probable effect of legislation upon the reduction of expenses. For instance, where in this bill an appropriation is provided to pay our share of the expenses of the Palace of Peace at The Hague, it occurs to me that under the gentleman's contention it would be germane under the Holman rule to offer a provision that a certain admission fee should be charged to the Peace Palace at The Hague, on the theory that the expenses of the United States in keeping up its share of the expense would be reduced. That is a far cry. It seems to me the Holman rule never contemplated to go so far as that, but that the rule in its essence must be construed strictly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Upon what earthly principle, except the principle I have undertaken to state, was the De Armond amendment held to be in order, simply the addition of the words "was or other"?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I concede that the gentleman has a precedent there which is very much in point.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I can cite many more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But I also say to the gentleman that I have studied pretty thoroughly the precedents on the Holman rule, and I think the gentleman can find under that rule a precedent for almost anything he desires.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; not at all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Because, after all, it is left to the discretion of the Chair, and I do not think too much should be left to the discretion of the Chair. I do not think the Chair should be left to do too much guessing.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I agree to that. Unless the Chair is reasonably satisfied as an intelligent man, from his knowledge of public affairs and the application of this amendment to the business of the country, that it is going to produce this fund and thereby bring about a reduction in the expense, then the amendment is not in order. But he has only to apply the principle of the De Armond amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In such a case as that, the Chair might believe that if an additional amount were charged for the issuance of a passport there might be as many passports issued at \$5 apiece as at \$1 apiece, but the gentleman can not say for a certainty that fewer applications might not be made for passports at \$5 apiece than at \$1. It is a guess on the part of the Chairman, and is bound to be—and I am one of those who believe it is the duty of the Chair to construe the Holman rule strictly—that he must not engage in any speculation whatever. It must be apparent to him as a man of common sense that an actual saving will be made by virtue of the legislation proposed, or the amendment is not in order, and I do not think it necessarily follows here.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The law now provides that a fee of \$1 shall be charged and collected for each passport issued from the State Department. We have before us the paragraph of the bill providing for the expenses of regulating entry into the United States in accordance with the provisions of an act passed on the 22d of May, 1918, and to carry that act into effect. That act provides that the power shall be given to the Secretary of State to regulate the issuance of passports and, as the Chair understands it, in a measure to limit the number of people who enter the United States. The gentleman from Texas proposes an amendment now to the appropriation which is made to carry out the provisions of that act, which amendment provides that a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each passport issued by the Department of State, and he contends that if the amendment is adopted it will reduce the amount of the appropriation on its face.

Clause 2 of Rule XXI of the House provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The law further provides that no such amendment shall be in order unless reported by a committee of the House having jurisdiction over the subject.

It must be apparent to the members of the committee that there is nothing on the face of this amendment to indicate a reduction in the amount of the appropriation. Of course, it is true that if the amendment should be adopted it would raise revenue, but the revenue would go into the Treasury to the credit of the general fund, and there is nobody here wise enough to say what that revenue would be appropriated for. It might not be appropriated for the payment of the expenses of the State Department at all; and on the face of the facts as the Chair sees them, he can not see any possibility of the reduction of the amount of the appropriation on its face resulting from the amendment of the gentleman from Texas nor can it be said that it will even increase the amount covered into the Treasury. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. PORTER. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question being taken, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, prior to rising, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion has been carried.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to keep my status.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PORTER. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit, which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the right of the gentleman to offer a motion to recommit, unless he is opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is no point of order pending. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order against the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I think as a member of the committee I ought to make the motion, unless somebody claims a prior right.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, but the Chair has asked the gentleman if he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone who is opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONNALLY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: Page 25, line 22, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$200,000"; and after line 23, page 25, add the following:

"Provided, That a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each citizen's passport issued from the Department of State, and a similar fee for each visé by the United States Diplomatic and Consular officer on each foreign passport, to be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund for carrying into effect of the purposes of this paragraph and the reduction of the same therein appropriated."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question on the motion to recommit, and the gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, no existing law authorizing the collection of \$5 for passports, the law now providing for \$1.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, although I have recently taken the floor in connection with this point of order, the principle involved is so fundamental that I will ask the indulgence of the Chair for recognition. His ruling in this matter will set a new precedent, with respect to amendments under the Holman rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to state to the Chair that the same amendment was ruled out of order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is slightly in error. This is not exactly the same amendment. The gentleman from Texas has modified his amendment to meet, in part, the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not catch what the modifications were.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. He reduces the amount appropriated from \$250,000 to \$200,000. I do not think that is necessary, but if it is necessary, then the necessary correction has been afforded. It was also stated in the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, that the amendment should come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I submit that this is not necessary. Rule XXI provides in part as follows: "Nor shall any provision in any such bill, or amendment thereto, changing existing law, be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill."

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, but the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This is an amendment that I submit comes within the benefit of this citation.

The SPEAKER. Is that the only ground on which it is supported by the Holman rule?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I submit, as I said, that this amendment comes within the protection of the rule, because it is an amendment that reduces the amount of money covered by the bill. It is not necessary for an amendment to show upon its face that it effects a reduction. Yet this amendment does make that showing on its face. It is sufficient to make the amendment in order, if it is apparent to the Chair, having in mind the law of the land, his knowledge of the public business, and the reasonably likely effect of the law proposed, that the amendment proposed will fairly operate by its own force to reduce the amount of money covered by the bill.

I call the attention of the Chair to a ruling on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. De Armond, to a pension appropriation bill. There was nothing in his amendment except the words "was, or other." The amendment did not show a reduction upon its face. But it was evident upon consideration of the effect of this language, as applied to existing conditions, that it would operate of its own vigor to reduce the number of pensioners. The fewer the number of pensioners, the less the amount to be appropriated under existing law on pension account. In other words the Chair reasoned the matter out, and drew a conclusion as to the effect of the amendment before ruling. It was not necessary for this conclusion of reduction to be established with the vigor and severity of a mathematical demonstration. It was only necessary for the Chair to conclude that the amendment would fairly operate by its own force to retrench expenditures in one of the ways contemplated by the rule. Unless the chairman had devised this conclusion of reduction from the insertion of the words, "was, or other" in the bill under consideration he could not have held the amendment in order. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (52d Cong., p. 1792). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] contends that this rule ought to be strictly construed. The precedents do not so hold. See ruling of Speaker Kerr and Chairman W. L. Wilson, IV Hinds, 594, that the Holman rule is a beneficent and proper rule, and should have a liberal construction. See also ruling of Chairman Crisp, Manual, p. 507. There are many other precedents to the same effect.

The rule should be both reasonably and liberally construed as stated by Speaker Kerr, and others, because it is in the interest of retrenchment, and in the language of Chairman CRISP, "it is intended to have a beneficial effect upon the Treasury of the United States."

Now, what is the amendment of the gentleman from Texas? He offers an amendment in the way of legislation to create a new fund by increasing the tax upon certain people. While the number of persons to be affected by this tax can not be stated with precise accuracy, yet it is known that it will be very large. It is perfectly competent for the Chair to take knowledge of that fact; it is perfectly competent for the Chair to take knowledge of the fact that an increase in the way of 400 per cent in the tax to be imposed upon these persons will create a very large fund. This fund is to be utilized for the very purposes for which the specific appropriation of \$250,000 is made.

The gentleman from Texas by his amendment sequestrates this fund for these very purposes. The chairman of the committee was in error in holding that this result of reduction would not follow from the amendment, that it did not show on its face that this result would follow. The fund to be raised is directed, as stated, to be used in lieu of the \$250,000 appropriation. And if only a single dollar should be raised by the new taxation in excess of the amount now raised, it would make possible to that extent a reduction in the \$250,000 appropriation. But as a part of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas this appropriation is reduced to \$200,000. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] insists that the Speaker should not guess about this reduction. I agree with him. If it is altogether problematical and uncertain whether any reduction will be effected, the amendment is not in order. But for an amendment to be in order under the Holman principle it is not necessary that the fact of reduction be established beyond a reasonable doubt or with the rigor of a mathematical demonstration. The likelihood of reduction under the legislation proposed is left to the Chairman. If the Chairman, after looking to the whole situation, concludes that reasonably speaking the legislation will operate of its own force to effect a reduction, then that will be sufficient ground upon which to hold that the amendment is in order.

I call the attention of the Chair to rulings under the Holman rule that were made in connection with the Army appropriation bill, rulings which I think were approved by the judgment of the House at that time. In one case an amendment was offered reducing the number of Cavalry regiments from 15 to 10. The Chair held that having reference to known facts, the maintenance of 10 regiments would not require so large a sum as the maintenance of 15 regiments. The Chair could not determine how much reduction would be effected by this cutting down of the number of these regiments, but it was perfectly clear that a reduction would be effected, and this conclusion was neither problematical nor conjectural. It was a reasonable conclusion, fairly certain from the entire body of facts submitted to the Chair, and considered in the light of reason and common sense.

May I call the attention of the Chair to further citations from this particular case?

The precedents say in this connection that the amendment, being in itself a complete piece of legislation, must operate *ex proprio vigore* to effect a reduction of expenditures. The reduction must appear as a

necessary result; that is, it must be apparent to the Chair that the amendment will operate of its own force to effect a reduction. (Manual and Digest, p. 409; Hinds, vol. 4, p. 595.) But is it not necessary for this conclusion of reduction to be established with the rigor and severity of a mathematical demonstration. It is enough if the amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, will fairly operate by its own force to retrench expenditures in one of the three ways indicated. This result must be a necessary result, not a conjectural result or a problematical result. It is true that having reference to the difference of minds, one Chairman might hold that retrenchment would be the necessary result of an amendment, while another Chairman or the committee on appeal might be of a different opinion. But this is inevitable. The law is clear, for instance, that at times a court upon the facts can hold as a matter of law that there was no negligence. Still upon the same facts one court will derive this conclusion, while another court on appeal will reach a different conclusion. (See Manual, p. 509.)

If the Chairman, looking to this amendment which provides for a new fund to be raised by new taxation, and which is set aside to be used for the purposes for which \$250,000 is created, is satisfied that the amount so raised will reduce the amount necessary to be appropriated under this head out of the General Treasury; if he reaches that conclusion, then, under the rulings—and I can cite many of them, but none stronger than those already cited—he should hold that this amendment is in order. Of course, if it is contended that this increase of tax on the vast number of persons that will be affected by the increase will not bring into the Treasury a larger sum than the present rate, and that contention is sustained by the Chair, then the amendment is not in order. But if that suggested contention is sound, then the Ways and Means Committee, which has been raising many rates to raise more funds, has been sadly at fault in that action. But that contention can not be sustained. There is not a man on this floor that is not satisfied that this increase in rate will bring a large additional sum into the Treasury. If so, then the legislation proposed will effect a retrenchment in expenditures and a reduction in the amount of money covered by the bill in this item, to wit, the sum of \$250,000. This being so, and the legislation being responsible for this reduction, it is not necessary to determine the exact amount of the reduction. Any reduction that is appreciable in the amount of money covered by the bill and that is effected by the legislation proposed in the amendment will make that amendment in order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is true that this amendment is not precisely in the same form as offered and ruled out by the Chair on a point of order in the committee. But the difference is a matter of form rather than of substance. I agree, however, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] in his contention that that makes no difference under his construction of the Holman rule. If under the Holman rule any sort of legislation can be offered to an appropriation bill the result of which may, in the opinion of the Chair, be eventually to decrease that appropriation, he opens up a field so wide that the Holman rule, I think, might be construed to cover any sort of legislation under any circumstances. Now, I believe the Holman rule ought to be construed strictly. I concede, as the gentleman from Virginia says, that its use may be beneficent where it actually curtails expenses. So far, so good, but I see also great danger in a construction of the Holman rule which, under the guise of reducing expenditures, permits legislation on appropriation bills. I am opposed to legislation on appropriation bills, and I think it ought to be guarded most carefully.

Now, take this case. It is contended that the raising of the fee on passports from \$1 to \$5 would increase the revenue and thereby tend to diminish the expense eventually. That may be true. But does anyone contend that it would be in order on the Post Office appropriation bill, for instance, to increase the rate on first-class postage from 2 cents to 5 cents, or from 2 cents to 10 cents—the proportion of increase in this case—on the ground that that increase of itself would eventually result in a decrease of expenditures?

I can not see very much difference between the two. You are raising the fee five times, increasing it by 400 per cent, as my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] says, and the Chair has got to take the view of it that that is going to necessarily decrease expenses, if his view is to be sustained.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker—conceding that you can find almost any precedent for any proposition under the Holman rule if you search the precedents carefully enough—that the Chair is justified in this case in assuming that as a matter of necessity the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is going to result in a decrease of appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for recognition to submit any further remarks on my account, but wish to conclude what I have to say with a citation from a ruling by a gentleman who is regarded by this House as an eminent parliamentarian, Mr. CRISP, of Georgia. It will be found on page 507 of the manual, under the head of Important Decisions. I read:



Now, the Chair, as before stated, believes the Holman rule is intended to have a beneficial effect upon the Treasury of the United States. If the Chair is in doubt about whether or not an amendment is in order, he believes it his duty to resolve that doubt against the point of order, for by so doing the Chair works no hardship upon anyone, but submits to the committee itself the privilege of passing upon the amendment. If the committee favor it, a majority can adopt it. If they are opposed to it, a majority can reject it.

The Chair believes the amendment in question comes clearly within the spirit of the Holman rule.

A number of citations from Hinds' Precedents supporting this ruling will be found on the page of the manual cited above.

The SPEAKER. It is argued that this amendment, which is clearly legislation and therefore out of order, is in order by the terms of the Holman rule. That rule provides—

Not shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States.

This amendment certainly does not do that. Again—

By the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

This certainly does not do that. Then again—

Or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

It must be then under that third clause of the rule that this must be sustained, if sustained at all. It is well settled that the amendment must clearly and certainly and necessarily cause a reduction. But it seems to the Chair that it is impossible for the Chair to be sure that this amendment really and finally reduces the amount of money appropriated in this bill.

To be sure the appropriation is reduced from \$250,000 to \$200,000 on its face; that brings it within the Holman rule. But while the face of the appropriation is thus reduced on the one hand, on the other hand an indefinite increase of the appropriation is made. By the terms of the amendment it is provided that an additional fee—in other words, additional revenue—shall be provided, which shall be put into the same fund from which this appropriation is drawn and which increases that fund by the amount derived from the tax. How much money that tax will produce no one has estimated. Therefore, whether that fund will be larger or smaller than it is now, after this money is collected, it is impossible for the Chair to tell. It may be \$200,000; it may be \$400,000.

It does not seem to the Chair that it is a fair interpretation of the Holman rule to say that by creating a new source of revenue and making a specific appropriation of that revenue, and at the same time reducing the amount which was before appropriated, a real reduction of appropriation is effected. Certainly you are not sure that any economy is secured. The expenses of the United States are not necessarily reduced in any way. On the contrary, it may very well increase them, because if the sum is larger than the original appropriation, then the department has so much more to spend and the outlay of the department would be so much larger. It seems to the Chair that this is not an economy, but on the other hand it might, under the guise of economy, be a very large increase in the expense. It is a novel suggestion that new taxes are economy or lead necessarily to a reduction of expenses. The Chair thinks the amendment does not necessarily reduce the appropriation of this bill and sustains the point of order. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. PORTER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3451. An act authorizing and directing the United States Shipping Board to adjust and pay the claims of wooden-ship builders arising out of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO A COMMITTEE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was necessarily called from the Chamber on account of sickness in his family, and he requested me to nominate, to fill a Democratic vacancy on the Committee on Elections No. 1, Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I move that the gentleman nominated be elected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas nominates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] as a member of the Committee on Elections No. 1, to fill a Democratic vacancy, and moves his election. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] may have five days within which to extend his remarks in connection with the memorial exercises for Mr. TAGSDALE. He was unavoidably absent yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] be given five days in which to extend his remarks in connection with the memorial exercises concerning Mr. TAGSDALE. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it stated in the RECORD that my colleague, Mr. WHALEY, who is confined to his apartment with the "flu," could not for that reason vote on the bill relating to the increase in the pay of men in the Navy last Friday. If he had been here, he would have voted aye.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by enumerating still further citations from the opinions of Judge CHASE, which I cited, and other citations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the citations referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting request for change in the wording of estimates for "Repairs and preservation of public buildings," so as to include buildings controlled by the Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 637); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department in the past calendar year; to the Committee on Printing.

3. A letter from the president of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway, transmitting report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the 12 months ending December 31, 1919; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER of Illinois, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12012) concerning the administration of the pension laws in claims for pension of persons who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and by the widows of such persons, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 585), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 587), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12077) to amend section 6 of the Federal-aid road act; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 12078) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditures," approved February 23, 1917; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 449) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information regarding the mutiny on board the U. S. S. *America*; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12079) granting an increase of pension to Adella Doersh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12080) to advance Capt. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12081) granting an increase of pension to Dwight F. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12082) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12083) to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 12084) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 12085) granting a pension to John L. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12086) granting a pension to Mary Wessel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 12087) granting a pension to Richard Oddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 12088) granting a pension to Ella E. Carbonell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 12089) granting a pension to Anna Redding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12090) granting a pension to Flora A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 12091) granting a pension to Kessiah Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12092) granting a pension to John Van Dyne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12093) granting a pension to Lloyd Newell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12094) granting an increase of pension to William L. Snider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 12095) granting a pension to Joseph Stocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12096) granting a pension to Elizabeth Schiemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12097) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 12098) for the relief of Annie M. Eopolucci; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging Congress to make sufficient appropriation for the early completion of the improvement of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1114. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Texas City Post, No. 89, American Legion, endorsing the Davey sedition bill, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. Also, petition of the National Association of Commissioners and Departments of Agriculture, opposing the repeal of certain features of Federal farm and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1116. Also, petition of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, relative to better understanding between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1117. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of sundry citizens from the State of Ohio, regarding railroad legislation now before Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1118. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers and Allied Trades of New York City, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1119. Also, petition of W. C. Whish, John E. Gray, Thomas E. Ryan, and John Fitzgibbons, representatives of the four great railroad organizations, opposing the Cummins and Esch railroad bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1120. Also, petition of the United Restaurant Owners of Greater New York, relative to the treatment of Jews of the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1121. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1122. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of the Robert Emmet Literary Association, of Fall River, Mass., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1123. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of the Women's Welfare Club of Marquette, Mich., relative to certain legislation in regard to the cold storage of food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1124. By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of Oklahoma Employees' Associations, favoring legislation that will prevent the production and exhibition of any picture purporting to show the impersonation of any desperado, bandit, train robber, or alleged outlaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1125. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Muskegon National Farm Loan Association at its annual meeting held January 13, 1920, protesting against the increase of maximum loans under Federal farm-loan act, also protesting against the taxing of Government farm-loan bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1126. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of W. C. Whish, John E. Gray, Thomas E. Ryan, and John Fitzgibbons, representatives of the four great railroad organizations, opposing the Esch and Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1127. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1128. By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of the Carpenters' Union, No. 483, of San Francisco, Calif., against the unseating of Victor Berger; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

1129. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1130. Also, petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers of New York, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1131. Also, petition of W. C. Whish, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Thomas E. Ryan, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; John E. Gray, Order of Railway Conductors; and John Fitzgibbons, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, opposing the Esch and Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1132. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of J. B. Murray and D. H. Gould, of Yonkers, N. Y., regarding the peace treaty and the League of Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1133. Also, petition of Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents, regarding the interest of farmers and the demands of organized labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1134. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, regarding proposed relief to manufacturers and importers from results of demoralization in customs service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1135. Also, petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers of New York relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1136. Also, petition of the United Restaurant Owners of Greater New York, relative to the treatment of the Jews of the Ukraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. Also, petition of H. A. Paterson, of New York, favoring all provisions in the Esch-Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1138. Also, petition of W. S. Price, of New York City, opposing certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1139. By Mr. VAILE: Petition of the Canon City (Colo.) Lodge, No. 610, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of the Rotary Club of Parkersburg, W. Va., relative to the "red" menace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.